DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 394 154 CS 509 231

AUTHOR Ciofalo, Andrew, Ed.
TITLE Proceedings of the Communications Conference of the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities (7th, Chicago, Illinois, July 26-30, 1995).
INSTITUTION Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities.
SPONS AGENCY Loyola Coll., Baltimore, Md.
PUB DATE Jul 95
NOTE 79p.
PUB TYPE Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Catholic Educators; Church Related Colleges; Communication Research; Course Descriptions; *Ethics; Higher Education; *Mass Media; Mission Statements; *Organizational Communication; *Religious Organizations; *Speech Communication
IDENTIFIERS *Jesuits

ABSTRACT

This booklet contains nine papers presented at the Communications Conference of the Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities. The booklet begins with the conference program, a list of attendees, and notes of the business meeting of the Association. Papers in the booklet are "Opening Remarks: A Call to Inaction" (Andrew Ciofalo); "Eloquentia Perfecta in a Multimedia Society" (W. Barnett Pearce); "17 Short Papers about Jesuit Communication" (Richard Blake); "Rome Meeting Articulates New Role for Jesuits in Communication Culture" (William E. Biernatzki); "The CSCC and Cooperative Work in the AJCU-CC" (Paul A. Soukup); "Looking for a Jesuit, Catholic Identity in Course Syllabi" (Mary Ann Danielson); "Privacy and Confidentiality as Ethical Issues in Corporate Communications" (Thomas A. Schick and Ida Critelli Schick); "Fordham's New York City Semester" (Ron Jacobson); and "Mission Statement" (Centre for the Study of Communication and Culture). (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 394 154

PROCEEDINGS
AJCU-CC

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities-Communications Conference

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND
DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL
HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
A Ciofalo

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Seventh Annual Meeting

Loyola University
Chicago

July 26 - July 30, 1995

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS509231

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROCEEDINGS

Seventh Annual Meeting

Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities- Communications Conference

Edited by Andrew Ciofalo
Associate Professor
Department of Writing and Media
Loyola College

Published in Baltimore at Loyola College
with special thanks to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, David Roswell, for financial support

AJCU COMMUNICATIONS CONFERENCE

LOYOLA UNIVERSITY CHICAGO
Wed., July 26 -- Sun., July 30

PROGRAM

Wednesday, July 26

Noon on Check-in and registration -- Simpson Living and Learning Center

6:00 p.m. Lakefront Picnic -- Piper Hall / Lawn

Thursday, July 27

7:00 a.m. Breakfast

Collaboration
9 a.m.

A Call to Inaction
Andrew Ciofalo,
Communication Conference President
Loyola College Baltimore

17 Short Papers About Jesuit Communication
Richard A. Blake, SJ
Le Moyne College

Cooperative Communication Ventures Among Jesuit Universities
James F. Scotton
Marquette University

***Eloquentia Perfecta* in a Multi-Media Society: A Provocation**
W. Barnett Pearce
Loyola University Chicago

Noon: Lunch

Jesuit Identity

2 p.m.

Shared Vision -- Jesuit Spirit in Education
(Video)

Report on Progress of National Communication Plan: Update Since Santa Clara
Thomas M. Rochford, SJ
Communications Director -- Jesuit Conference
Washington, DC

Communication: A New Culture
The Document on Communication of the 34th Jesuit General Congregation
William E. Biernatzki, SJ
Center for the Study of Communication and Culture
St. Louis University

CSCC and Cooperative Work in AJCU
Paul Soukup, SJ
Santa Clara University

Dinner/Evening On Your Own

Friday, July 28

7:00 a.m. Breakfast

Curriculum

9 a.m.

Course Syllabi as Socialization Strategy: Presence or Absence of a Jesuit, Catholic Identity
Mary Ann Danielson
Creighton University

Teaching a Large Lecture Class at a Jesuit University
Don Fishman
Boston College

Teaching Gender Roles and Communication at Boston College
Lisa Cuklanz
Boston College

Using the Communication Major-as-Citizen Role to Demonstrate Communication Knowledge and Proficiency in a Senior Capstone Seminar
William Ryan
Rockhurst College

Noon: Lunch

Assessment
2 p.m.

Process and Outcome of Department Mission Statement
Mara Adelman
Seattle University

"Outcomes Assessment" for a Jesuit Mission Statement
John Caputo
Gonzaga University

New Methodologies in Communication Assessment: Item Response Theory and Structural Relations Analysis
John Hollwitz and Mary Ann Danielson
Creighton University

Dinner/Evening: On Your Own

Saturday, July 29

7 a.m. Breakfast

Communication for Service
9 a.m.

Have We Got Media Internships: A Closer Look at Fordham's New York City Semester Program
Ron Jacobson
Fordham University

Community Based Radio -- the Lakeshore Community Media Project
Jeff Harder
Loyola University Chicago

Privacy and Confidentiality as Ethical Issues in Communicating Organizational Information
Thomas Schick, Ida Schick
Xavier (Ohio)

Noon: Lunch

Conclusions
2 p.m.

Interest Groups around Conference Issues

Business Meeting

Reception/ Buffet Dinner

Sunday, July 30

8 a.m. Breakfast and conversation

Departure

ATTENDEES

Mara Adelman
Department of Communication
Seattle University
Broadway and Madison
Seattle, Washington 98122-4460
(206) 296-5344 (W)
(206) 296-5997 (F)
mar@seattleu.edu

Brother William E. Biematzki, S.J.
Centre for the Study of Comm. & Culture
St. Louis University
321 North Spring Avenue
St. Louis, Missouri 63156-0907
(314) 977-7290 (W)
(314) 977-7296 (F)
cscc@sluvca.slu.edu

Richard A. Blake, S.J.
Le Moyne College
Syracuse, New York 13214-1399
(315) 445-4621 (W)
(315) 445-4722 (F)
blakera@maple.lemoyne.edu

John S. Caputo
Communication Arts
Gonzaga University
Spokane, Washington 99258
(509) 328-4220 (W)
(509) 484-2818 (F)
caputo@gonzaga.edu

Andrew Ciofalo
Writing/Media Department
Loyola College Maryland
Baltimore, Maryland 21210
(410) 617-2728 (W)
(410) 343-0570 (F)
ciofalo@loyola.edu

Lisa M. Cuklanz
Communication & Theater
Boston College
215 Lyons Hall
Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts 02167
(617) 552-8894 (W)
(617) 552-2286 (F)
cuklanz@bcvms.bc.edu

Mary Ann Danielson
Department of Comm. Studies
Creighton University
2500 California Plaza
Omaha, Nebraska 68178
(402) 280-2530 (W)
(402) 280-2143 (F)
maddam@creighton.edu

Donald Fishman
Department of Communication
Boston College
Chestnut Hill, Massachusetts 02167
(617) 552-4285 (W)
(617) 552-2286 (F)
fishmand@bcvms.bc.edu

Mary Pat Haley, B.V.M.
Department of Communication
Loyola University Chicago
6525 North Sheridan Road
Chicago, Illinois 60626
(312) 508-8525 (W)
(312) 508-8492 (F)
mhaley@luc.edu

John Hollwitz
Department of Comm. Studies
Creighton University
Omaha, Nebraska 68178
(402) 280-2532 (W)
(402) 280-2143 (F)
jcholl@creighton.edu

Ron Jacobson
Department of Communication
Fordham University
20 Osee Place
Cos Cob, Connecticut 06807
(718) 817-4849 (W)
(203) 629-3664 (F)
Gary Kolarcik
"Contact"/Sacred Heart Program
3900 Westminster Place
St. Louis, Missouri 63108
(314) 533-0320 (W)
(314) 533-0335 (F)

Robert V. Lyons, S.J.
Communication Arts Department
Gonzaga University
502 East Boone Avenue
Spokane, Washington 99258
(509) 328-4220 ex 6047 (W)
(509) 484-2818 (F)

Bren Ortega Murphy
Department of Communication
Loyola University Chicago
6525 North Sheridan Road
Chicago, Illinois 60626
(312) 508-3732 (W)
(312) 508-8492 (F)
bmurphy@luc.edu

John Pauly
Saint Louis University
Department of Communication
3733 West Pine Boulevard
St. Louis, Missouri 63105
(314) 977-3192 (W)

W. Barnett Pearce
Department of Communication
Loyola University Chicago
6525 North Sheridan Road
Chicago, Illinois 60626
(312) 508-8824 (W)

(312) 508-8492 (F)
bpearce@mail.luc.edu

Rev. Thomas M. Rochford, S.J.
Jesuit Conference
1424 16th Street NW-Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 462-0400 (W)
(202) 328-9212 (F)
tomrochford@aol.com

William Ryan
Dept. of Communication & Fine Arts
Rockhurst College
1100 Rockhurst Road
Kansas City, Missouri 64110
(816) 926-4042 (W)
(816) 926-4588 (F)
wryan@vax1.rockhurst.edu

Ida Schick
Graduate Program in Health Services Administration
Xavier University
Cincinnati, Ohio 45207-5171
(513) 745-3716 (W)
(513) 745-3705 (F)

Thomas Schick
Dapartment of Communication Arts
Xavier University
Cincinnati, Ohio 45207-7331
(513) 745-2954 (W)
(513) 745-4301 (F)
schickt@xavier.xu.edu

James F. Scotton
Department of Journalism
Marquette University
Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53233
(414) 288-5608 (W)
scottonj@vms.csd.mu.edu

Paul A. Soukup, S.J.
Communication Department
Santa Clara University
Santa Clara, California 95053
(408) 554-4022 (W)
(408) 554-4913 (F)
psoukup@scuacc.scu.edu

Rev. Paul S. Tipton, S.J.
Association of Jesuit Colleges & Universities
One Dupont Circle, Suite 405
Washington D.C. 20036
(202) 862-9893 (W)
(202) 862-8523 (F)
blkrobe@aol.com

Jennifer F. Wood
Communication Department
St. Joseph's Hall 215
Santa Clara University
Santa Clara, California 95053
(408) 554-2158 (W)
(408) 554-4913 (F)
jwood@scuacc.scu.edu

NOTES

AJCU Communication Conference Business Meeting
Loyola University Chicago
July 30, 1995

* Andy Ciofalo commented on the importance of this conference as a means of establishing connections between and among the Jesuit colleges and universities.

* Andy asked that all conference papers/presentations be forwarded to him, preferably on disc, by Sept. 30.

* Regarding the timing of future meetings, the group recommended mid to late June as a preferable time -- after June 15 for those schools on quarter calendars.

* The 1996 meeting will be at Gonzaga University in Spokane, Washington.

* Regarding the 1997 meeting, the group discussed the possibilities of mounting an international conference in Rome at the Loyola Rome Center. While there was some enthusiasm for the idea in principle, many participants raised questions regarding finances. Most schools do not fund foreign travel. Some feared that having the conference abroad would automatically cut the attendance in half. Bill Biernatzki said he would contact the Jesuit central offices in Rome to see if there might be ways to fund such a meeting. Ron Jacobson, Bill Biernatzki, Andy Ciofalo and Mary Pat Haley will form a sub-committee to do some fact-finding.

* In the meantime, other sites were named for the following years:
  -- 1997: Boston College or Fordham
  -- 1998: Xavier or Creighton
  --1999: Santa Clara or Loyola Marymount

* The group discussed broadening participation in the conference and networking with Jesuit institutions with departments of communication who haven't been active in

the group. The group recommended opening participation to all communication faculty. Letters would be written to chairs, vice presidents and deans, and presidents of the schools advising them of the value of the AJCU-CC. John Hollwitz (Creighton) talked about using e-mail to garner interest in the AJCU-CC. John also announced that he had already begun to establish an e-mail group of AJCU participants.

* Regarding an idea that had surfaced earlier in the conference, a group was formed to investigate with the editors the possibility of devoting a future issue of **Conversations** to the subject of communication. Paul Soukup (Santa Clara), Tom Schick (Xavier), John Caputo (Gonzaga) and John Pauly (St. Louis) volunteered to direct this effort.

* Regarding ideas for future discussion/future conferences:
-- faculty exchanges among departments/schools of Jesuit universities
-- changing curricula
-- faculty development / training
--compiling a directory of faculty members in the departments of communication which would include teaching and research interests
-- more on capstone courses
-- approaches to assessment
-- internship programs in other cities
-- more on mission statements
-- successful advising programs
-- communication as art / creation
-- #2 and #3 of Jesuit films
-- foundation courses
-- conflict management within faculties

Mary Pat Haley, BVM
Conference Program Chair
Loyola University (Chicago)

CONTENTS

A Call to Inaction/*Andrew Ciofalo*/Page 1

Eloquentia Perfecta/ *W.Barnett Pearce*/Page 5

17 Short Papers/*Richard Blake S.J.*/Page 12

New Role for Jesuits/*William Biernatzki S.J.*/
Page 22

Cooperative Work/*Paul Soukop S.J.*/Page 27

Course Syllabi and Jesuit Identity/
Mary Ann Danielson/Page 29

Ethical Issues in Corporate Communications/
Thomas A. Schick and *Ida Critelli Schick*/
Page 47

New York City Semester/*Ron Jacobson*/Page 59

Mission Statement/
Centre for the Study of Communication and Culture/Page 61

Opening Remarks: A Call to Inaction

Andrew Ciofalo
Loyola College in Maryland
AJCU-CC President, 1995-96

Welcome to the Seventh Annual Meeting of Association of Jesuit Colleges and Universities-Communications Conference (AJCU-CC). Since the organization resurrected itself at St. Louis in 1989, by next year, we will have had 4 meetings in the Midwest, 3 in the West and 1 in the East. Now that we have a system of rotating meetings, the future promises a more balanced distribution coast to coast.

This has been our most solid achievement in seven years. I believe that not so long ago we voted, under the inspired urging of Santa Clara's Tom Shanks, to establish a dues to develop a fund to defray promotional expenses. No one has complained about our failure to follow through on this. And thanks to Bert Akers, we developed two years ago a constitution, which we promptly put away and never consulted.

Is this a crisis in the making? When we pay no heed to our basic operating principles and when we fail to organize ourselves to accomplish specific goals, can this be considered critical? Our group constantly articulates broad goals of inter-institutional cooperation --in technology, in research, in service and in pedagogy. Yet we rarely commit to these initiatives with broad endorsements or any accountable follow through. We certainly are not a proactive group, and I am concerned that given the parameters of success within our culture, we will see our lack of action as "failure."

As a relatively young organization, the problem is not that we expect too much of ourselves; rather it is that we are unsure of our expectations. Add to this a tinge of guilt over spending hard-to-come-by travel monies simply to keep in touch and share ideas, then the vague need to have concrete accomplishments suddenly becomes an imperative. And Dick Blake's (Le Moyne) observations that our definition of Jesuit-based education often

encompasses trite platitudes that are equally applicable to secular education is a direct challenge to our sense of being different (*i.e.*, value-based). Maybe we need to look at ourselves and our institutions in a totally different way, perhaps reinvent ourselves.

In this annual "state of the organization" assessment, I would suggest that what looks like ennui is merely a reflection of the dissonance in Jesuit ranks over the mission and goals of Jesuit education. I consider it a sign of intellectual acuity and mental health that our instincts for inaction are so finely honed.

While we profess to share a common set of values, we are subject to the same theoretical divisions that have divided our communication disciplines. Now can we count on a shared set of Jesuitical values to keep us centered on common goals that vary significantly from the goals of the Catholic institutions and secular institutions.

Yet, I think that each of us attending these meetings feels that there is something "special" about our Jesuit identification, something that sets us apart from other institutions, perhaps even above them. This sounds dangerously like an elitist attitude, and if that is the case, then we are depending on image and reputation to carry us. And nothing will stifle initiative more quickly than an elitist mind set that enables us to rest on our laurels, even if we merited those lauded at a different time, in a different place, under different conditions. Is it possible that our impulse to talk and stand pat are a form of nostalgia?

Our association and our annual meetings are really about "connectedness." We live in a rapidly changing environment, both for the academy and our disciplines. For those of our departments enjoying the trappings of technological and enrollment success, we feel demeaned by bring valued at our institutions primarily for bringing home a reliable pay check - the cash cow for less productive programs. Yet those departments whose development have been thwarted by administrations that see our discipline bringing up the rear of academic priorities, yearn at least for the practical recognition that an investment in communication programs will yield a tenfold return on the bottom line.

I am going to suggest that being technologically advanced on our campuses is not the only way to serve the interests of our students. There are some colleges represented here

that have "zero" technology and while this may have many liabilities (*i.e.*, attracting and keeping young faculty), I have not heard a lament that the graduates of these programs are not finding niches in their chosen careers at any less rate than our students from our more advanced programs.

In fact, the technologically poor schools may have a distinct advantage. They stay focussed on the cognitive development that is necessary to understand and function in the new communications environment. The emergence of anthropology and its sidebars in popular culture and intercultural communication gives these institutions the opportunity to hire faculty from a broad spectrum of disciplines - a situation that can enrich a department's dialogue with other departments in an institution. Those of us that are too deeply invested in technology have the limiting burden of hiring technologically oriented faculty, of creating a technological gap between older and younger faculty, and turning out students who are more adept at gadgetry than content. I don't think the idea of the "philosophical plumber" works here.

This has been a long route to share with you what I think AJCU-CC is all about. It is not about leaders and followers. It is about sharing responsibilities. It is not about getting us all up to the same speed. It is about appreciating our intellectual diversity, respecting our various orientations, and learning from each other. Sometimes we'll dwell too much on political strategies that in the end will homogenize us into indistinguishable institutions. I like to hear John Pauly (St. Louis) talk about his strategies for educating communications majors and reshaping the mission of his department to serve students despite the continued lack of technology for the foreseeable future. Departments such as his are best positioned to articulate the place of our discipline within the core curriculum and perhaps ride point for all of us in establishing the centrality of the communications discipline to the development of an intellectually astute citizen.

This organization is valuable in that it is a sounding board for ideas and a way of connecting individuals and institutions with similar or common interests and philosophies. There are spectacular ideas that emanate from our conversation pit after the stimulus of a thoughtful presentation. Creating opportunities for like-minded people

and institutions to join forces, not under the AJCU-CC banner, to follow through on programs, projects and studies.

I think one of the highlights of our annual meeting should be a session on how connections made at AJCU-CC resulted in a cooperative venture or simple innovation. We can talk about a web page or a guide book or a published directory or an electronic journal, but it takes only one of us to start it and open it up to all of us. AJCU-CC is not here to give an imprimatur to your efforts, but rather to enhance and encourage your ideas through general reaction and the voluntary association of those members interested in working together.

I admit that I find it hard not to be grandiose in my thinking concerning the role of AJCU-CC. My proposal that we meet in Rome and with representatives from European and other nearby Jesuit institutions is simply a device to get us focussed on issues of globalization in our curricula and programs. Maybe some of us will combine to work on a joint international program - and I'll admit I'm primed to jump into such a venture. Maybe others will find the resolve and vision to chart a separate course.

I think the greatest gift we can give ourselves is continued fellowship in a non-judgmental atmosphere. Continued respect for our diverse approaches will encourage the openness, honesty, caring and sharing that will make it worth while for us to continue returning annually and perhaps invite others of our colleagues to share in this wonderful experience. This is the only place where I can come to engage in a Jesuit dialogue without the usual catch words of Jesuit-lay collaboration. What we have here is a true adhocracy.

Therefore, this year I am not asking for the broad endorsement of the AJCU-CC for a mission, philosophy or concrete objectives. Rather I am inviting any of you with a special interest to voluntarily step forward and indicate what you intend to do, based on what you will have heard at the meeting, to contribute to the development of this organization as a catalyst for faculty, student, departmental and institutional development.

Eloquentia Perfecta in a Multimedia Society

W. Barnett Pearce
Loyola University Chicago

In 1993 the Task Force on the Core Curriculum presented a "Report" to the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at Loyola University Chicago. The "Preamble" to the report contained three paragraphs. The second paragraph described "eloquentia perfecta" as one of the major elements in the Jesuit tradition for higher education. (The first paragraph simply cited the Jesuit tradition as the context for Loyola University; the third claimed that action as well as intellect was the involved in the educational mission of a Jesuit university.)

After giving such a place of pride to "eloquentia perfecta," the "Report" of the Task Force nowhere referred to the department, discipline, or field of communication. I found this surprising since I believe that we have, or should have, or at least should want to be perceived as having, some connection with whatever is meant by "eloquentia perfecta." To repeat, while I brandish the Report as Exhibit A, nowhere is "communication" -whether as department, discipline, field or, horror of horrors, courses -- mentioned in the entire report.

To the Administration and colleagues on the Task Force at Loyola, I addressed many messages, noting their oversight and seeking to inform them of our vital role in preparing students for "eloquentia perfecta." As Department Chair, my role was appropriately a forensic one. But to this intramural group of colleagues from departments of communication, I want to be more deliberative and pose the following question: Why, in the minds of administrators, students, Boards of Trustees, etc., is the department, discipline, or field of communication so often seen as disconnected from whatever might be meant by "eloquentia perfecta"?

As a provocation, I suggest that we have not practiced "eloquence" very well. The etymology of communication is "to make common." Well, we haven't made much in

common.

During the past three years, our department has revised its entire curriculum. In the processes, we have been both aided and hampered by the fact that there is no standard curriculum, or even an array of standard curricula, in our field. Perhaps there should not be, but in terms of our ability to explain who we are to administrators and colleagues not in our discipline or field, the absence of such standards is a problem.

Last year (1994), two major histories of the field were published by distinguished scholars: Everett M. Rogers, *A History of Communication Study: A Biographical Study*. New York: The Free Press: 1994, and Hermann Cohen, *The History of Speech Communication: The Emergence of a Discipline: 1914-1945*, Annandale, VA: Speech Communication Association, 1994. In his review of these books (*Communication Theory*, 5, 1995, pp. 181, 183-4), Bob Craig said, "Astonishingly, these two books do not overlap at all; not a single person or topic is more than mentioned in both... Neither quite explains how we got where we are, but each illuminates places where some of us, or anyway parts of us, have come from. In their mutual obliviousness, no less than in the wealth of data they present for contemplation and the many historical questions they leave unanswered, these books may finally tell us more about the future agenda of communication studies than about the past of our field."

Craig's astonishment, feigned as it might be, would only be increased were he to include in his review a third history of our discipline or field published the year before: Billy I. Ross, ed., *Seventy-Five Years of Journalism and Mass Communication Leadership: The History of the Association of Schools of Journalism and Mass Communication*. Columbia, South Carolina: ASJMC, 1993. These three books, which I here brandish as Exhibit B, have no more in common than if they were describing three unrelated disciplines or fields. Whatever else this does, it hampers our ability to explain ourselves as central to "eloquentia perfecta" to Task Forces, Deans, and Trustees.

About five years ago, a group of scholars under the leadership of Brenda Dervin undertook the task of re-thinking communication. They published two volumes of essays: Dervin, Brenda, ed. *Rethinking Communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage, 1989. Their

conclusion: there is no way to subsume under any single story the various schools of thought, paradigms, traditions of communication theory. While I brandish these books as Exhibit C, pose in your mind again the question, why, in the minds of Trustees, Task Forces and the occasional marauding Dean, is the discipline, field, and department of communication disassociated from "eloquentia perfecta"?

It is not my purpose to bewail the current condition, I am much more interested in focusing on how we might go forward.

One way not to go forward is by the more forceful assertion of any one of our multiple traditions or paradigms. That is, we do not do well to assert that Rogers' or Cohen's or Ross, et al.'s version of our history and current status is correct, no matter how eloquent the argument. I say this because this strategy is forked on a dilemma. If the advocates for these and other versions of the discipline engage in forceful advocacy *and none succeeds in carrying the day*, then we have simply reproduced the same pattern that we now find ourself in, but at a higher level of intensity. On the other hand, *if someone succeeds in claiming_the discipline/field for a particular story*, then we have imposed one story on others in an act of historical/intellectual fascism against which all right-thinking men and women of good will will be compelled to revolt, and we have lost the richness of the suppressed traditions and paradigms.

One way in which we might go forward is to give attention to the skills that our students need for eloquentia perfecta in the world in which they live. The effect of this is to reverse figure and ground. Often we foreground our intellectual tradition, identifying ourselves with the media we study (speech; mass) or profession we shadow (management; journalism) and use this as the "frame" in which we develop courses, advise students, and represent our departments/discipline/field to our colleagues. I am suggesting that we instead foreground the experience of our students and bring to that experience whatever we find useful from our intellectual tradition. I believe that this shift, subtle as it seems, will, to borrow a phrase, "from many a frightful blunder free us."

Let me start with the hackneyed observation that Freshmen matriculating in Fall, 1995, who complete their schooling in the "standard" four years, will be looking for

jobs or graduate schools in the year 2000. What kind of world will they live in?

Some fairly obvious and noncontroversial characteristics of the contemporary and near-future social world are these.

1. It is a multi-media world, in which media are not just alternative ways of transmitting messages but, as Walter Ong, S.J., has taught us, are powerful forces shaping forms of consciousness and patterns of social institutions. Our students will live in a world unlike most of our departments, in which orality, literacy, what my colleagues like to call videocy, and what we might yet learn to call cybercy are simultaneously present. We do our students a disservice if we teach them that these media are separate, and our teaching is counterproductive if it does not teach them to identify and move eloquently among the various media (and the forms of consciousness and social structures which attend them) that are in contemporary society.

2. It is a world in which the relative density of various media vary tremendously from place to place. It is not the case that all of the current elementary school generation are computer literate: it is the case that elementary school children differ as much or more in their computer literacy than do adults. And to whatever extent that computer literacy gives a person an advantage, we will be dealing with a society whose diversity is increased by just that increment between the "haves" and the "have nots." One of the skills required of our students is that of discerning relative density of various media (and the forms of consciousness and social structures which attend them) and learning how to move eloquently among them.

3. It is a world in which the pace of change is rapid. of course, the speed of change is a relative matter, and I mean that it is rapid both using the metric of precedent (that is, change occurs more rapidly than it used to) and using the metric of a human life (that is, a person with a normal life-span will have to confront change many times). The implication of this for eloquentia perfecta is that forms of communication have a short life cycle and that they do not necessarily transfer well from one place to another (because that other place is changing as well, according to the logic of its own evolution), and that patterns of communication are often layered, in which several patterns, some obsolete, some current, and some avant garde are juxtaposed in the

same time period. Whatever else eloquence means in such a world, adaptability, creativity, and responsiveness are crucial elements.

4. It is a global world. Gadamer makes good use of the metaphor of horizons. In the contemporary world, it is impossible to rest comfortably within narrow horizons. Even the assertion of ethnic or intellectual uniqueness must be done within a complex set of global relationships in which the horizons have moved so far back that we meet ourselves on the far side. Whatever else eloquence is in the contemporary world, it cannot be provincial.

5. It is a world in which communication is not just a personal act nor a political force but a big business. One of the crazymaking aspects of the contemporary period in the United States is that we try to make communication policy using the discourse of the 18th century; we talk of "freedom of speech" and "freedom of the press" in terms of Congress passing no law that would abridge it. Actually, we have done pretty well in freeing communication from the long hand of King George III and of the U.S. government ... and in so doing, we have delivered it into the hands of business. Communication is not free; it is the slave of the forces of the marketplace.

Are we teaching students *what they need to know* and *need to know how to do* in this kind of world?

Another way in which we might go forward is to give attention to differential forms of communication. All talk is not alike, just as all written material is not alike nor all television programming. I believe that we live in a social world in which very different forms of communication cohabit but that we have a relatively underdeveloped professional ability for discerning the differences among them.

Let me contrast just three of these forms, with no sense that this is a comprehensive list. There is "strategic communication" in which we have a specific agenda and we communicate in ways designed to entice, trick, or force others to support that agenda. This is very different from "deliberative communication" in which we engage with others in a process of what David Mathews calls "choice-work." Here we argue, listen, and otherwise reason together to evaluate options and choose among alternatives. It is hard work, and it is often painful, and it requires collaboration with others. Deliberation is different

from dialogue, in which we open ourself to another and seek to understand and be understood. One of the best descriptions of dialogue was given by Abraham Kaplan (quoted by Rob Anderson, Kenneth N. Cissna, and Ronald C. Arnett, eds. *The Reach of Dialogue: Confirmation, Voice, and Community*, Cresskill, N.J.: Hampton Press, 1994, p. 9).

"When people are in communion, when they are in this narrow sense really communicating with one another, the content of what is being communicated does not exist prior to and independently of that particular context. There is no message, except in a post-hoc reconstruction, which is fixed and complete beforehand. If I am really talking with you, I have nothing to say; what I say arises as you and I genuinely relate to one another. I do not know beforehand who I will be, because I am open to you just as you are open to me. This, I think, is what makes growth possible among human beings, and why it seems to me impossible really to teach unless you are learning; why you cannot really talk unless you are listening. You are listening not only to the other, you are listening to yourself. Indeed, in a fundamental sense -- I would say in a quite literal sense -- self and other are now so intertwined that we need new conceptual frameworks, new categories to describe what is happening."

Note that I am not making the ontological argument that these three categories exist. Rather, I am using them to make the argument that it is important to differentiate among forms of communication.

Recently the Regents of the University of California voted to end "affirmative action." Ward Connerly, an African-American businessman who was the Regent who proposed the decision, has been claiming ever since that he is misunderstood by those who favor affirmative action. That is, he would like to be enmeshed in something like dialogue. Certain cynics saw the hand of California governor Pete Wilson behind the move and wondered what conversations occurred between Wilson and Connerly. Wilson was positioning himself for a run for the Presidency and repealing affirmative action is one of the topics he had hoped to ride into the White House. These same cynics think that Wilson for sure and maybe Connerly are talking about affirmative action in the context of strategic communication.

The form of communication makes a difference, and our research as well as our teaching, might well be focused on helping our students discern among dissimilar forms of communication

Eloquence in a multimedia social world in which dissimilar forms of communication cohabit, and colonize each other, and engage in complicated patterns of domination is not easy. Rather than looking backward to our separate histories as the basis for explaining ourselves to our students, Deans, and various Task Forces, what would happen if we were to focus on that which is needed to help our students -- and, Lord help us all -- ourselves to be eloquent in such a world?

17 Short Papers About Jesuit Communication

Richard Blake, S.J.
Le Moyne College

Late last May, when the rivers opened and canoes from the outside world could reach Syracuse, an enterprising merchant named Jacques Blockbuster brought a carton of videotapes to our trading post. For three beaver pelts and a moose steak I obtained a splendid video entitled "32 Short Films About Glenn Gould," by the Canadian director Francois Girard. The film inspired me to entitle this presentation "17 Short Papers About Jesuit Communication." The advantage of this format is that by the time you have decided that you are furious with something I have said, I will be saying something else.

Paper #1

We are all talking about "Jesuit tradition," "Jesuit identity," "Jesuit character" or "Jesuit education."

Old timers tell me this is a new phenomenon. When the Society of Jesus owned and operated the American 28, their "Jesuitness" was taken for granted. The provincial appointed the president, who was often rector as well. He in turn appointed his Jesuit cronies to the board of trustees. Deans and other petty individuals normally were the brethren. Jesuit teachers were represented in virtually every department, and occasionally were taken seriously. Philosophy and theology were mandatory and the rules of dorm life bore the scent of the seminary. How Jesuit can you be? What's to talk about? Well, the schools have gone through cataclysmic change in the last 35 years and now there's quite a bit to talk about. As we prepare to enter a post-Jesuit phase of Jesuit education, we'd best try to discover what we are talking about.

Paper #2

The conversation seems to be getting nowhere.

True enough. There is no one magic formula that will fit a major research center like Loyola Chicago and a

community based enterprise like St. Peter's in Jersey City. Just when we have a mission statement we can agree on or have published a slick brochure like the one put out last year at Boston College, the school sets off in a new direction or some new wind blows through academe and one faction or another is outraged that this phrase was included and that dropped. Back to the drawing board for another round of consensus building.

Paper #3

We're sick of the whole thing.

That's true, as well. We all want to get back to the business of teaching. It's extremely frustrating to realize that the task may never be finished and the perfect formula may never be crafted. Most of us like closure to our efforts, and this topic will not close.

Paper #4

A great deal of the frustration comes from our attempting to invest too much in the term "Jesuit." We lose focus.

All too often the term Jesuit is hijacked to support differing political agenda, and we are back to riding our predictable hobby horses. This is particularly infuriating. It muddies the waters, to coin a cliche, and makes everybody as mad as hell, to coin another, on issues that have little to do with Jesuitry.

One group will use "Jesuit tradition" to argue for a return to the 1950s: This is a Roman Catholic institution and if you don't like it, get out. Teach only the official statements of the Holy See. Take attendance at Sunday Mass. Give the dorm prefects flashlights.

More frequently, others use it to consecrate the agenda of the 1960s and 1970s, or 1990s. We need a massive dose of honesty and humility on these points. Jesuit colleges have struggled with social-justice issues just like any other institutions. Being Jesuit gives them no inside track. Let's look at a few examples.

Georgetown and the Jesuit seminary at Woodstock Maryland were built with the earnings of plantations. In the 1930s an eminent American Jesuit prepared a statement for the Vatican, maintaining that Christians should not persecute Jews, since it only made them "more stiff-necked." Fortunately, the document was never published. At St. Louis, in the 1940s, Jesuits were

expelled not only from the University but from the Missouri Province for insisting that social events should be open to all students, regardless of color.

The tradition is not helpful in dealing with the women's issues either. St. Ignatius carried the baggage of his Basque heritage and his military background. His original prejudices were reinforced when one of the three women he was forced to accept into the Society of Jesus was a descendent of the Spanish Queen, Juanna la Loca (Johanna the Mad). Sister Johanna apparently lived up to her family tradition. As a result, Dominicans, Benedictines and Franciscans have women's orders, and Jesuits don't. Some of his comments about women in the Spiritual Exercises would have Ignatius up on charges in an American university today. In America, the Catholic boys generally went to the priests and brothers and Catholic girls to the sisters. It's probably fair to say that Jesuit institutions were not hostile to women; they were just not involved, and the sisters, with their own schools to support, were happy to keep it that way.

From the founding of the first Jesuit school in Sicily in 1548, Jesuits have always argued about whether they should educate the disadvantaged so that they can help themselves, or should concentrate on elites, who could be expected to create a just society as they moved into leadership roles. The unanswerable question is not "Why is there no Jesuit Harvard?", but "Should there be a Jesuit Harvard?" I suspect the faculties at Georgetown and Detroit-Mercy would come up with different answers. Can anyone argue that our present policies on these matters evolved and continue to evolve without confusion and conflict?

Paper #5

At its worst, the discussion of Jesuit heritage leads to same generalities that any educational institution would embrace.

Once we cut through the distractions of our favorite political agenda, we come up with descriptive statements equally suitable for any kindergarten or barber college. Could you imagine any school advertising that it educates the partial person? Or offers large classes? Or deals with students on an impersonal basis with absolutely no

attention to their individual needs? Or refuses to prepare anyone for rewarding careers and public service. In other words, the characteristics of Jesuit education that we put into our promotional literature are often an embarrassment. They mean nothing.

Paper #6

It's important to keep at it.

If a school is to maintain any distinctive character, and if its faculty is to be part of an educational tradition with any claim to special value, we have to keep asking ourselves what our schools are trying to do and how do we as individuals fit in? The conversation is important not only for the university in its marketing efforts but for ourselves as professional educators.

Paper #7

Jesuits have no principles.

This is key. The Society of Jesus was not founded as a teaching order. No one formulated a philosophy of education and then started a pious organization to put it into practice. In fact, the early Jesuits didn't know what they wanted to do. They turned this indecision into a virtue, maintaining that they wanted to remain free to do anything that the church needed, anywhere and at any time, "for the good of souls." They seemed eager to travel to remote places, a tradition that remains very much alive today -- although currently Paris, Hilton Head and Disneyland seem more desirable destinations than the Paraguayan rain forests or the tundra of northern New York State.

In a very short time, however, while Ignatius was still alive, the Jesuits found themselves in the school business. In their travels, these early Jesuits started to read the signs of their times. Here's what they saw: exploration and colonization, technology and revolution, the Protestant reformation and Italian renaissance, and a Church that seemed singularly unprepared for any of it. The need for education seemed paramount. The week long visit to a village with a few catechism lessons, a musical pageant and a barn burner of a sermon to get the burgers into a confessional didn't have the lasting impact that they wanted. Goodbye to the open road and light horse cavalry concept of ministry. Hello to the schools, and fund raising, building maintenance, years of secular studies,

fights with local politicians and ecclesiastics and collaboration with laymen and laywomen. They didn't plan it; they didn't intend to be school teachers; it just happened. Or perhaps more accurately, God wanted it to happen.

Paper #8

Jesuit education, then, is a specifically spiritual and Catholic ministry, one of many forms of ministry that Jesuits could have undertaken "for the good of souls."

As a monk in good standing, I regret that many of us are afraid to say this. The overarching goal of Jesuit activity in the early days was (and I hope remains today) "the good of souls." In an age when good Catholics believed that there was no salvation outside the church, the early Jesuits believed that travelling around the world to make converts, keeping Catholics from slipping away and making practicing Catholics more fervent were goals to be pursued by any means necessary. For some strange reason, in a very short period of time, they concluded that teaching mathematics and rhetoric, grammar and physics, theater and dance were the best means available to accomplish these goals.

Paper #9

The Jesuit tradition is opportunistic.

The early Jesuits were ingenious in exploiting their opportunities for ministry. At first, rather than involving themselves in running schools, they simply opened residences in university towns and got the best available education for their own scholastics on the cheap. Later, when they needed money to feed these young men, the priests taught a few courses themselves, accepting no fee for their services, but with the understanding that they would receive a healthy subsidy from the municipality or generous townspeople. Eventually, they saw the folly of their ways and took off in hot pursuit of tuition-paying bodies. To make these colleges attractive to lay students and their checkbooks, they had to offer secular subjects alongside the seminary curriculum. When they discovered that these "open" colleges were actually a splendid way to further "the good of souls," they reached out aggressively to expand their network of schools around the world. Somehow the original idea of using lay students merely to

support the education of future priests dropped away. They wanted to exploit their markets to keep the schools financially sound and thus provide an apostolic launch pad for their work of "saving souls."

How many of our universities today are going through endless market analyses of opportunities for new programs, evening divisions and the like? Are the humanities faculties upset? Do they claim the administration is trying to destroy the character of the institution for financial gain? I could imagine the same allegations being hurled back and forth in Jesuit recreation rooms in the 16th century. The Jesuit tradition lives!

Paper #10

The Jesuit tradition is adaptable.

As we discover in our present day discussion, there is no one model of Jesuit education that fits every circumstance. It changes from one culture to another. The early Jesuits had to analyze the needs of the native peoples of Paraguay, of sophisticated Roman nobility or Indians in Goa and adapt their form of education to the personal and cultural needs of the people. As the situation changed, so did the schools. Imperial power switched from one country to another and finally collapsed as independence movements succeeded. The schools had to adapt in order to survive. In China, India and to some extent in the Americas, the early Jesuits showed a remarkable ability to learn languages, cultures and religious traditions. As men of their time, their ultimate goal, of course, was to lead all peoples to Christ, but their ability to see God's activity in varied ways led them to respect the beliefs of others and get into hot holy water with the Vatican, where Christianity and Western European culture were not only inseparable, but synonymous.

Today in our country, the colleges that once served the needs of immigrant German and Irish Catholics now try to carry out their mission amid a bewildering mixture of cultures, just at the early Jesuits did. The relative homogeneity of American Catholic culture has evaporated. How do we adapt to the new realities of our society? How on earth can we serve the needs of various peoples, while keeping some kind of Catholic identity for "the good of souls." How do we even say this without being accused of proselytism or cultural imperialism? In some ways, the

early Jesuits seem more successful at this than we are, but maybe that is because the less successful were boiled in oil or trampled by elephants.

A footnote to this notion of adaptability may hit close to home for some of us. The early Jesuits did not seem to regret turning their schools over to native peoples when the time came to move on. It's sad when today so many Jesuits and our most enthusiastic lay supporters complain that the Catholic character that I loved at Holy Cross in the 1950s has been destroyed. The Jesuits are selling out and letting lay people take over "our" schools. Serving souls, reading the signs of the times and moving on is the Jesuit tradition of adaptability. The challenge for the next generation of Jesuit educators --and in the United States these will include very few Jesuits-- will be to discover its own appropriate strategies for "the good of souls.

Paper #11

The Jesuit tradition is incarnational and humanistic.

Jesuits are worldly, and not only in the sense that they know the best restaurants in town, or in any other town for that matter. In the spiritual sense, are not comfortable in the sacristy. They try to find God in all sorts of people and things and ideas. For the good of their souls, students at Jesuit institutions should learn not to flee from the secular world but to embrace it. This is not, however, the same thing as being held hostage by it, as though there were no universe worth investigating outside the material order. Questions of spiritual value and personal commitment ought to be very much at the heart of the education experience at a Jesuit college.

Paper #12

This search for values and personal commitment involves dialogue between varied cultures and social classes.

Not everybody poses the questions in the same way. The early Jesuits followed the paths of exploration and conquest around the world and were enriched by contact with other cultures. Even in Europe they insisted in mixing students from different social classes and in Prague even taught Protestants alongside Catholics. Sure of their own identity, these pioneers welcomed exchange between those of differing traditions.

Surely in this group it is not necessary to point out how

the modern means of communication have speeded up and intensified the exchange of ideas, not only on campuses but throughout the world. Paradoxically, at this stage, the ease of communication today makes the dialogue more difficult. It frightens people. As long as I do not know what blacks, Hispanics, AIDS victims, women, the elderly, aliens and the Michigan Militia feel and think, they don't bother me. Each newscast and talk show makes these competing demands more public and thus more threatening. The result, at its gentlest, is the backlash vote of 1994; at its worst it creates other Bosnias, other Ruandas.

The Jesuit university can be a civilized forum for continuing the dialogue between differing social classes and value systems. Frequently, as we all know, it fails, but often too it is a stunning success, a fact that we may be too slow to appreciate.

Paper #13

Current usage translates "the good of souls" as "the service of faith and the promotion of justice."

Here the secular and spiritual goals converge. From a standpoint of our faith and respect for the faith of others, we confront the injustices in society and gather the resources to combat them. This is a spiritual, godly activity, whether or not a person is a believer. Atheists and agnostics can collaborate in this work, aided and encouraged, it is hoped, by the atmosphere of a Jesuit tradition that asks embarrassing questions and seeks realistic solutions, wherever they may be found.

Paper #14

Outside the campus, in the American scene at large, this project especially involves dialogue with dogmatic secularists.

Is there any doubt that one of the most spectacular failures of the academic community has been its blindness to faith? What a surprise when we discovered enormous power of "Muslim fundamentalism," or "the religious right" or even the Catholic Church during the collapse of Communism in Eastern Europe. Religious people, quaint relics that they are thought to be, inhabit a world that has become meaningless for the vast majority of Western intellectuals and opinion leaders. How do we learn to listen respectfully but critically to this dominant culture and

get it to listen to us.

That's where we communications scholars come in.

Paper #15

The study of media reveals the values of the dominant culture.

Research can help us understand what the dominant culture really believes. It helps us get below the surfaces and find out whether any common ground exists that will make this dialogue more fruitful. A simple example: my own work on the films of Woody Allen has revealed to my satisfaction an enormous core of religious sensibility. Allen would deny this, of course, but it's there. I'm sure research on the other media is equally rewarding. Through our writing and teaching, we can help our society discover its real values and the values being relentlessly marketed to them. On a good day, our research may even provide feedback to the media industries. On a very good day, they may act on it.

Paper #16

Its national and international character makes the Jesuit network a particularly suitable environment for such reflection.

Meetings like this are merely a slight indication of the enormous resources we have at our disposal. We are part of a network of 28 institutions of higher education in this country and over 200 throughout the world. We claim some kind of common Jesuit heritage, even though we know how difficult it is to say exactly what that heritage is. We are have the capability to engage in dialogue on a vast scale.

In its recent General Congregation, 300 Jesuits from around the world, with their many different cultures and political and social histories, hammered out statements not only on in-house topics but on issues like culture, the intellectual life, universities, the ecology and even women. They were trying to set directions for engaging the issues that today's world is struggling with. That's the kind of work we ought to be doing in our universities. I hope to suggest, however, that our primary partner in dialogue in this time and place is dogmatic secularism of the media in our own country. We can't begin to have justice in America, if our only faith rests on an unspoken but real

belief in personal economic gain, to be achieved through the use of the right toothpaste and the right underarm deodorant.

Paper #17

The enterprise is so vast that no one person or one faculty can embrace its entirety. The work requires the contributions of all different kinds of people from many different backgrounds.

That's why we need all sorts of people to join in the effort: Jesuits and non-Jesuits; Catholics and non-Catholics; believers and non-believers. The richer and more diverse the conversation we have among ourselves and our colleagues, the more we will have to offer in the wider dialogue we join for "the good of souls."

Rome Meeting Articulates New Role for Jesuits in Communication Culture

Brother William E. Biernatzki, S.J.
Centre for the Study of Communication and Culture
Saint Louis University

The 34th Jesuit General Congregation met in Rome during the first three months of 1995. One of its major efforts was to write documents which would formulate policies regarding various aspects of the Society's life and activities for the next few decades.

Communication has been mentioned in documents issued by previous General Congregations. For example, Decree 4 of the 32nd General Congregation (1975), "Our Mission Today," listed communication as one of the four priority dimensions of the work of the Society, along with theological reflection, social ministry, and education. As that document put it, all four dimensions were to be brought together in all the activities of the Society, with the goal of "the service of faith and the promotion of justice," which was to be the aim of all Jesuit work.

Nevertheless, this document of the 34th General Congregation is the first document that any Jesuit general congregation has ever devoted entirely to communication. It is one of 23 documents issued by GC34, and is grouped with five others, under the heading, "Dimensions and Particular Sectors of Our Ministry."

Each of the twenty-three texts was drafted by a committee. The committee on communication, like the others, included a broad spread of geographical representation, but it was heavily influenced by two North American members, Fathers Pierre Belanger, of the French Canadian Province, and John Privette, Provincial of the California Province. Both hold advanced degrees in communication studies.

Father Belanger is the co-director of JESCOM-Canada, the Jesuit secretariat for communication work in that

country, and he also works in audio–visual production at the Centre Saint–Pierre in Montreal.

Before becoming provincial, Father Privette taught in the communication department at Santa Clara University. Consequently, while the document is for the guidance of Jesuits throughout the world, it has a North American flavor and accurately reflects the mass media situation in North America.

So far, the documents of GC34 are only available in "interim" form. Their "definitive" texts, in three languages, are being worked over and translated by Jesuit editors in Rome. Nevertheless, there is no reason to believe the official texts will differ significantly from the interim texts.

As the title —"Communication: A New Culture"— suggests, the document stresses the changes which electronic communication is making in contemporary culture. It says that Saint Ignatius recognized and responded to a comparable change which was occurring in his own time, the 16th Century. Then, it was printing with moveable type which was revolutionizing European culture. That change brought with it massive changes in social and intellectual life which required a whole new approach to growth in the spiritual life, as well. Historians have noted that one reason for the rapid spread of Protestantism in early 16th century Europe was the Reformers' eagerness to use the latest printing technologies and the tardiness and even reluctance of Catholics to use them. That Catholic attitude gradually changed, and the early Jesuits were some of the leaders in promoting the change.

In the present day, the growth of the electronic mass media, together with the data–processing and information revolution, confront us with a challenge comparable to that which printing posed for Ignatius and the early Jesuits. It is not only the technologies which are changing, but our ways of learning, knowing, and even thinking and reasoning. As the text of the Communication Document says: "This world of communication develops what is widely identified as a new culture, one that is non-linear, image-oriented, intuitive and affective in its understanding of the world."

The flow of electronic images not only comes at us more rapidly than was possible in the print media, but it also

often is disjointed and ambiguous. Frequently, it is manipulative, urging us to buy things or do things we would not otherwise want to buy or do. The values the media represent often challenge Gospel values and they can subtly undermine the spiritual and moral character of their audiences. But, if used correctly, the new media also offer tremendous opportunities for learning and both personal and social development. The electronic media create a new kind of cultural environment, and we need new skills to successfully engage it, survive it, and use it for constructive purposes.

The new document reiterates and emphasizes even more strongly what the 32nd General Congregation had said about communication being not so much a *sector* of Jesuiapostolic activity, of interest only to those Jesuits who specialize in it, but a *"major apostolic dimension"* of the work of all Jesuits. It says, "Clearly, not all Jesuits should engage in media. Nevertheless, every Jesuit, in order to be effective, must be aware of and well versed in the language, symbols, and strengths and weaknesses of the modern communication culture. This is a way to *make the shift*, to realize that this new communication environment is a milieu in which large numbers of people can be reached and enriched, where literacy, knowledge and solidarity can be fostered."

The Society of Jesus always has been committed to the proclamation of the Good News of the Christian message, but effectiveness in that proclamation requires the use of a language understood by the audience. The cultural changes brought about by the electronic media have brought with them changes in language, which must be accommodated to if communication is to be effective.

All Jesuits and all Jesuit apostolates, including the university apostolate, are committed to the "service of faith and promotion of justice." But to serve faith and promote justice in the modern world requires use of the modern language—as it has been shaped by the electronic media. Jesus used parables drawn from the life of his time and place to communicate his message. Contemporary Jesuits are called upon to learn how to phrase the same message in terms which their own contemporaries can relate to and understand.

The methods and means used to adapt to and use the modern media can be very diverse, according to the

document. The means to be used depend on the situation, and can range all the way from television production and the Vatican Radio —for which the Society has long been responsible— all the way down to folk media, street plays, and bulletin boards.

The document explicitly mentions the need to coordinate the action of "Christians and other people of good will" to promote the freedom of the press wherever it is threatened or suppressed. Collaboration with others also is needed to bring about another requirement of justice in worldwide communications, that is "an equitable flow of communication between industrialized and developing countries." All peoples not only should have an equal chance to express their own cultures and their own needs through the mass media, but they also should have the right not to always have their own media dominated by the borrowed cultures and values of the richer countries.

Media education also is emphasized by the document as something in which Jesuits should be involved —to help give people a critical understanding of the media and thereby a means both to protect themselves from its abuses and to use it most effectively for their own human development. It encourages Jesuits to "be among the best media educated people in order to participate in this broad educational task." Jesuits, themselves, have to be trained in how to use the media constructively, for their own well–being as well as in their apostolic work. So, the document recommends a stronger emphasis on communication training in the formation of all Jesuits. What is needed is an understanding of the potential of the media which can be integrated into the other apostolates of the Society in the most constructive and useful way. Some should specialize in communication work, but the whole Society has to be aware of it and its potential application to other dimensions of the Society's work.

The text of the communication document met with a generally favorable reaction from the delegates to the General Congregation. One of its weaknesses, as one delegate commented to me, is that, while the "information revolution" is mentioned, it is not adequately treated. The implications of the revolution in data transmission, information retrieval, and other "non–mass" uses of telecommunications technology may ultimately prove to be of greater importance than the *mass communications*

revolution which preoccupies the writers of the document.

Where do we go from here? "We," in our immediate context, means not only Jesuits but all who are collaborating in the communications teaching and research of the American Jesuit Colleges and Universities. To answer that question, we have to ask where we have come from and where we are now.

I think we have come a long way. Most American Jesuit colleges and universities appear to have some kind of communication program. Some have been outstanding. The Society, itself, has not hesitated to assign young Jesuits to studies in this area. The Society has established a secretariat (JESCOM) in its Roman Curia to coordinate its communications activities throughout the world, and each regional area of the Society has both a secretariat and an organization for coordination of the work in its own area. Jesuits have been prominent in the work of Unda (the Catholic broadcasters' organization),UCIP (the Catholic journalists' organization) and OCIC (the Catholic film–makers' organization). This gathering of representatives from the communication departments of Jesuit colleges and universities testifies to an ongoing eagerness to strengthen that work through inter–institutional cooperation.

That kind of cooperation is needed if we are to know how to proceed most effectively in the future. The field of communication studies and practice is so broad that there is danger of becoming isolated in our own specialties and cut off from effective collaboration with each other. This has been a problem among Jesuit communication specialists in the past. Some have enthusiastically studied communication and begun work in production, research or teaching, only to become frustrated by their isolation, restricted funding, and seeming lack of interest from superiors and co–workers. I don't know that we can do much about lack of funds, but gatherings like these can help overcome the feeling of isolation and can give each one the realization of working in common cause with many others around the country in an endeavor which is both at the heart of today's culture and an essential instrument for our spiritual and intellectual work.

The CSCC and Cooperative Work in the AJCU–CC

Paul A. Soukup, SJ
Santa Clara University

This topic, which could as well bear the title, "Common Themes for Research and Publishing," invites us to think about ways in which we can work together to take advantage of what we have in common, particularly when it comes to research. Three sources of support have emerged: Loyola University Press, The Centre for the Study of Communication and Culture at Saint Louis University (CSCC), and our own departments.

One resource could be the Loyola University Press (soon to be renamed Loyola Press). Fr. George Lane, SJ, the director of the Loyola University Press, briefly addressed the group about the Press's current projects and invited members to submit ideas or manuscripts to one or another of their divisions. The Loyola Press publishes grammar school and secondary school textbooks, "popular academic" books on Jesuit themes, materials related to Chicago, and materials on religion and spirituality.

Second, the CSCC can be a catalyst in this regard since its mission is to facilitate communication research, provide support, and promote networking. The CSCC maintains a good library, particularly of communication–related periodicals from around the world. It invites visiting scholars and will provide office space and some support staff. The CSCC has identified several areas of research associated with our common mission to promote social justice, which tend to be ignored. It has published reviews on some of them in *Communication Research Trends*, and it would welcome further work.

While no one wishes to legislate topics of research, here are some areas that need work: Quality Television (recently reviewed in *Trends*), democratization and communication, non– governmental organizations and communication, communication and justice, communication and human rights (set for a special issue of *Communication* to coincide with the anniversary of the Universal Declaration of

Human Rights), communication policy studies (for example, deregulation of telecommunications), communication and pedagogy, service learning in the communication curriculum.

Let me make a special plea in regard to the final item. Last year at the SCA convention, I chaired a panel to discuss this issue. Those of us at the panel decided to seek a publisher who would bring out a book on service learning, featuring case studies of what communication departments are doing. If any of your faculty incorporate service learning, please pass word of this along and I would be happy to include their work in the book.

Third, we have great resources within our own departments. The AJCU-CC can promote greater cooperation or even "friendly competition" to facilitate people's research. We might start with a directory of faculty and their research interests so that people would know who to call for ideas or possible collaboration.

[This latter point stimulated a good discussion and an offer from Creighton to set up a computer list server for the purpose. In addition, Paul Tipton, SJ, from the AJCU described the AJCU web-server and explained how it would become available to the AJCU-CC group.]

Looking for a Jesuit, Catholic Identity in Course Syllabi

Mary Ann Danielson
Creighton University

The 1980s have been dubbed the "culture decade." Management gurus such as Tom Peters and Robert Waterman, Jr. opened America's eyes to the possibilities of creating and maintaining an organizational culture. The cultural view of organizations was soon adopted by various organizations, to include educational institutions. Schools, colleges, and universities recognized the various cultures that existed within the institution, the various departments, and the classroom. Staton (1990), in adopting an ecological perspective on college/university teaching, also recognizes the classroom as having a culture. Citing Condon (1986), she identifies the communication norms and patterns that emerge from classroom interactions as constituting the culture of the particular classroom.

Under the dialectical perspective of educational socialization, teachers and students co-create this classroom culture. According to Gorham (1990), "there is no such thing as a generic student. Students are active, co-creators of the classroom environment" (p. 220). To some extent, students and teachers socialize each other in order to create this classroom culture. Socialization is traditionally achieved via communication. Communication (meanings) can be culturally defined as emergent and intersubjectively created/negotiated (Louis, 1983). In other words, from a dialectical cultural perspective, teachers and students work together to create/negotiate meanings for themselves.

Socialization may take a number of forms: primary versus secondary and/or various types of secondary socialization. Whereas, primary socialization occurs from birth, secondary socialization occurs once we prepare to enter organizations and may take two forms:

--occupational or role socialization and

--organizational socialization (Staton-Spicer & Darling, 1986).

Occupational socialization refers to the "process by

which a new member to an occupation becomes acquainted with the culture of the occupational group, including the norms adhering to the role which the new member is to perform" (Corbett, 1980, p. 11). In other words, through various sources and experiences, both students and teachers learn what it means to be a "student" or a "teacher." In addition to occupational socialization, once the teacher is hired by a particular school or school district, or a student is accepted at a particular school, they must begin to learn the culture of the school (system) in which he or she now teaches/learns.

One particular tool that facilitates the socialization of teachers and students within the classroom environment is the course syllabi. While it appears to be underutilized (as a socialization tool) in today's classrooms, the course syllabi can play a very real role in classroom socialization (Danielson, 1995). Initial results indicate that course syllabi have the ability to transmit role-related and cultural knowledge, initiate dialogue and negotiation, and reduce uncertainty or "surprise." Given the amount of time that students and teachers spend together, it is both appropriate and necessary that our research efforts are directed toward classroom socialization, in general, and course syllabus as socialization strategy in particular.

As "there is no meaning without context" (Bateson, 1972) and as classroom socialization occurs within a particular university or college context, we must examine this larger university or college context. Universities and colleges may be characterized as public or private, with further distinctions based on size, selectivity of admissions, etc. Within private colleges and universities, Jesuit institutions stand out as having a unique presence. Jesuit institutions are not only private, but they tend to support basic principles or tenets which include: a rigorous curriculum (rigorous and imaginative scholarship), personal attention (*i.e.*, cura personalis), integration of values into the curriculum, a solid grounding in the liberal arts, and an emphasis on speaking eloquently and writing clearly (LeMoyne college catalogue with notations from Santa Clara's admissions materials). It is within this larger environment that we, as academicians and scholars, operate.

Does this larger context influence the classroom socialization and does the course syllabi reflect the

socialization into this larger university context? Answering these questions underlie the purpose for this paper which specifically explores the role of the course syllabi in classroom socialization by content analyzing communication course syllabi from various Jesuit institutions. In this paper, I will provide additional background materials on the socialization process and how it relates to utilization of course syllabi as strategy, answer three research questions, and discuss the conclusions and implications of this research.

Secondary Socialization

Educational research surrounding the secondary socialization process is usually characterized by models and stages. The two models used as the general framework for educational research are the functionalist and dialectical models. The functionalist model views communication-as-action (Staton-Spicer & Darling, 1987), and research via this venue identifies outcomes of socialization (*i.e.*, attitude shifts and conformity). As Zeichner (1980) observes, most of the studies within the functionalist framework "have emphasized accounts of how the individual adjusts to the constraints of social structure to the neglect of analyses of the individual's role in resisting and in transforming the social structure" (cited in Staton-Spicer & Darling, 1987, p. 13). According to this view of socialization, teachers [and students] are the objects of socialization, the passive receivers of communicative messages and socialization strategies.

The dialectical model of socialization, on the other hand, views communication-as-interaction or transaction (Staton-Spicer & Darling, 1987). Under this approach, socialization is viewed as a dynamic process and assumes that individuals are active constructors of their own experiences. Research under this model include socialization strategies, selection of socialization agents, and personal strategies to meet individual needs.

Consistent with previous streams of teacher socialization research and congruent with my personal views on communication and socialization, I have chosen to subscribe to the assumptions of the dialectical model. In my view, socialization is a process, dynamic and complex. Some researchers (e.g., Hess, 1993) have gone so far as to utilize Venn diagrams to depict the dynamic processes of

organizational socialization. According to Hess (1993), socialization "involves many processes that overlap chronologically, regress at times, form spirals, and fit into multiple categories" (p. 196). Therefore, at a minimum, we should consider socialization from a process or dialectical perspective. In particular, we can consider socialization as a process of seeking information to reduce uncertainty.

Socialization as Uncertainty Reduction

Based on the theoretical work of Berger (1987) and Berger and Calabrese (1975), Staton-Spicer and Darling (1987) apply uncertainty reduction theory (URT) to the process of socialization. Specifically, they argue that socialization occurs as a communication process of seeking information to reduce uncertainty about the role or occupation, but also about the organization or culture.

Classroom socialization can now be reframed as the communicative process by which individuals attempt to reduce uncertainty about themselves, their roles, and their membership in a particular organization (classroom). Teachers and students, therefore, engage in the socialization process so as to reduce uncertainty or the "surprises" associated with their role and the organization (Louis, 1980). The methods that are utilized may vary, but one possible method for creating meanings within the classroom context is the course syllabus.

Syllabus as Socialization Strategy

Syllabi are "course documents developed by instructors primarily to communicate to students the structure and procedures for courses" (Wulff & Nyquist, 1990, p. 249). Syllabi function to inform students of the scope of the work, to identify the sequence the work will follow, and to describe the tasks by which success will be determined (Saunders, 1978; as cited in Civikly, 1990, p. 60). Due to the nature of their functions, syllabi tend to be distributed the first day of class. As a result, the course syllabi as socialization strategy is grounded in the encounter stage of socialization.

Upon encounter, or the first meeting, the course syllabi enables students to determine "the nature of the class, expectations for participation, written work (including due dates), class procedures and policies, and a sense of the

person who is the teacher" (Civikly, 1990, p. 61). In other words, the syllabi provides socialization content; specifically, role-related (*e.g.*, what they needed to do, expectations about their participation/role in the class) and cultural (*e.g.*, how the class was to be conducted, the learning styles employed, etc.) learnings.

This content, according to Friedrich and Cooper (1990) is especially important. Based upon interviews with a number of students, Friedrich and Cooper (1990) categorized the types of information that students typically sought their first day of class. The three types of information were course coverage, course rules, and teacher personality. These three types of information correspond with the findings of Civikly (1990), and reinforce what many of us may have already known: Students are as interested in the person teaching the course as in the content of the course.

Initial research results, while not directly exploring the role of course syllabi as socialization strategy, seem to support the conclusion that a well-constructed syllabi can satisfy the very real desires of students to know about the course content, classroom rules, and teacher expectations. To the extent that the syllabi can transmit role-related and cultural knowledge, it is contributing to the classroom socialization process.

The syllabi can further contribute to the classroom socialization process by serving as a contract (analogous to the psychological contract operating in organizations) and by reducing classroom uncertainties. The syllabus as contract can serve as the document by which the classroom practices, expectations, and norms are discussed and codified. Any later ambiguities of meanings can be resolved by examining the contract that exists between the parties.

The syllabus as contract should allow for dialogue and negotiation. Students as active agents (co-creators) of the culture should participate in the construction and codification of the practices and expectations. This is not to say, however, that students should ultimately (singly) determine the course content or standards for the course. Rather, it should be an interactive process by which the instructor works with the students to develop the course (or modify the syllabus) so as to make the course as relevant and meaningful as possible.

My work with students enrolled in Success Prep, an employability training program, demonstrates that allowing students to assist in setting the "normative" culture for the group can and does work. At the beginning of the term, the group determines the rules for the class. While the teacher may introduce ideas, the students are equal partners in the process. Rules for classroom behavior have included: only one person talking at a time, no chewing gum (a rule of the facilities we were using), treat others as you would like to be treated, and the teacher is not always right. Equal participation often increases the groups' "ownership" in the class and increases their "investment" in its success.

The course syllabus can also contribute to socialization by reducing uncertainty or minimizing the amount of "surprise" that one experiences, especially the first day of class. According to Friedrich and Cooper (1990), uncertainty can be reduced in one of three ways: passive strategies, active strategies, and interactive strategies. Each of these three strategies can be evident in a course syllabus.

A passive strategy requires that information be gathered through indirect means such as unobtrusive observation. The course syllabus can serve as a passive strategy in that the students can observe the teacher as s/he explains the syllabus. According to Civikly (1990), students develop a positive view of the teacher's investment of time and energy when they see the syllabus the teacher has created. Additional passive sources of information could include attendance policies and office hours (*i.e.*, "open" or "closed" door policy). Each of these items sends a signal to the student about the type of course it will be and the type of teacher you will be.

An active strategy requires the individual to interact with others to gain information. The syllabus, as distributed, gives the students and their coursemates the information they will need to answer each others' questions. Additionally, students can and will learn from observing and following the lead of their coursemates. (See the Social Information Processing Model [Salancik & Pfeffer, 1978] for a fuller discussion of the role of peers in processing [organizational, environmental] information).

Finally, interactive strategies require the student to directly interact with the primary source of information in order to reduce uncertainty. The teacher's style and

34 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

manner may indicate the degree to which s/he is open to questioning. To the degree to which the teacher is comfortable, s/he should employ immediacy behaviors (*e.g.*, eye contact, establishment of appropriate distances, smiling). Immediacy behaviors should decrease the student's anxiety in approaching the teacher. The greater the communication between the teacher and student, the more interactive the socialization process.

Theoretically, it appears that course syllabi have a very real role in classroom socialization. Initial results indicate that course syllabi have the ability to transmit role-related and cultural knowledge, initiate dialogue and negotiation, and reduce uncertainty or "surprise." Given the potential of course syllabi as socialization strategy, this paper moves beyond the theoretical to examine actual course syllabi utilized in communication(s) departments at Jesuit universities and colleges.

To date, no one has really analyzed the specific categories of materials on course syllabi, especially at Jesuit institutions. Therefore, this research asks the following two questions:

RQ1: What information is included on communication course syllabi?

RQ1a: Do course syllabi reflect the presence or absence of the Jesuit, Catholic identity of the institutions? Because of prior socialization (educational) experiences, students and teachers do not enter the classroom *tabula rasa*. Therefore, it is important to explore what they may be bringing into the classroom in the form of expectations. Specifically,

RQ2: What might students/teachers expect from the institution, faculty, and/or classroom based on materials provided by the Admissions Office? Because this study was not able to directly survey students or faculty, materials that a freshman student or newcomer faculty might receive were used as the basis for expectations. Additionally, as there are no previous studies in this area, research questions rather than hypotheses were posed.

Methods

Participants

Directors of Admissions and Chairpersons in the Communication(s) Departments at 15 Jesuit institutions were contacted and asked to provide the informational

packet given newcomers and departmental mission statements and course syllabi respectively. Thirteen of the fifteen Directors of Admissions supplied the requested material for a return rate of 87%. Because some of the Jesuit institutions have more than one communication(s) department, seventeen letters were addressed to the chairpersons at fifteen institutions (these 15 institutions were identified as the institutions which actually had communication(s) departments). Seven chairpersons (7/17 for a return rate of 41%) provided both their departmental missions and a numbers of course syllabi (range 7-69). The differential response rate may have been caused by the timing of the requests. Letters were sent in mid-May. While admissions staff were still at work, many departmental chairs may have already left for the summer or been on vacation when the request was sent.

Procedures

Admissions materials were read and reviewed without benefit of a preexisting categorization structure. With no available categorization system for required admissions packets' materials, the author identified the repetitive themes and unique claims made by the individual institutions. No attempt was made to create a taxonomy of admissions materials, although the materials sent were amenable to further analysis.

Likewise, the course syllabi were examined with no preconceived categories of information. Categories were allowed to emerge naturally from the data (syllabi). Titles of categories were derived from the syllabi themselves. Once the categorization system was established, each of the 157 syllabi were reanalyzed via the newly established categorical system. Statistical analysis was limited to descriptive statistics, primarily numerical averages. Additionally, the number of pages in each syllabus was counted. All statistical results are noted as percentages and reflect institutional averages.

Results

As newcomer students' and faculty's expectations may be formed by introductory materials and may influence faculty in their construction of the syllabus, research question two will be addressed first. Results, of the review of Admissions materials, reflect a clear, identifiable

Jesuit theme as modified by the unique geographical characteristics of the various institutions (See Appendix A for a listing of selected excerpts.)

The Jesuit theme was predominant in the literature and included strains of tradition, ideals, philosophy, and values. LeMoyne College and Marquette University promote themselves as a "Catholic college founded in Jesuit tradition" and "education in the Jesuit tradition" respectively. Regis University advertises itself as "Jesuit. That, in a single, word, speaks volumes about the character of Regis University. . . .our focus on Jesuit tradition. . .is sharper than ever. You can see it in the sense of exploration that sets the tone throughout our varied and exciting curriculum."

Jesuit education claims more than a century of Jesuit tradition. Member institutions also claim to reflect Jesuit ideals, philosophy, and values. These ideals, philosophy, and values include: "the Jesuit ideal of creating intellectually challenging and religiously generous young men and women" (Boston College); "personal attention of a distinguished faculty, who strive to help students develop habits that will enable them to continually seek and find answers" (Fordham University); "challenging academic expectations" (John Carroll University); and "cura personalis, academic excellence, rigorous and imaginative scholarship, affirmation of its Catholic identity, and celebration of diversity and dialogue" (Santa Clara University).

These common themes are modified, however, by the unique characteristics of the various institutions. For example, Fordham University advertises its dual identity: a Jesuit institution of higher learning *and* a New York institution. Santa Clara University promotes itself as California's oldest college while the University of Detroit-Mercy self-identifies as Michigan's largest Catholic University. These unique characteristics often prompt the various institutions to make unique claims. For example, Xavier University is "no Brand Y [institution]". (Not to be outdone)The "Madison Avenue types" (of Fordham University) advertise that "every moment of your class experience here is designed to expand your ability to think critically and to understand the vital connections that link what you learn in the classroom to the world outside it." John Carroll University goes even further, [We are] "Jesuit

to the core. . . .John Carroll isn't Jesuit in name alone-but in spirit, in quality, in reality."

In summary, institutional materials promote an image of Jesuit tradition, heritage, and values where newcomers will be met by a dedicated, quality faculty who are concerned for the development of the whole person. Faculty are highly trained, highly qualified teacher-scholars-practitioners who are accessible, interested, and talented. Given these recurring verses of the overall Jesuit theme, it is reasonable to see how student and/or faculty enter the campus and classroom with certain expectations, which when combined with prior anticipatory socialization, affect organizational socialization.

The classroom syllabi, which may also affect organizational socialization, tended to include twelve categories of information, although specific information varied across and within institutions . The twelve general categories of information (See Table 1 for complete summary.) included: the instructor's name, office phone, home phone, office location, office hours, description of the course, required texts, educational goals for the course, course requirements, policies and procedures, grading (standards and/or requirements), and a course outline (week-by-week description of course activities).

Additional materials that were unique to various syllabi included: E-mail addresses, specific assignment requirements, sample papers, course structure and/or format, instructional aids and methods, explicit course expectations (*e.g.*, class participation, open to visits with students outside of the classroom), teaching philosophy and personal notes (*e.g.*, following one instructor's home phone number and address was the message: I am not the Tinman, I do have a heart).

While there were some universal standards, such as instructor's name, across all institutions, there were also some institutions that had relatively consistent formats (*i.e.*, over 85% of all syllabi contained the same elements) for their syllabi. Three institutions that had a relatively consistent format included: Fordham University, University of Loyola-Chicago, and Creighton University. Other institutions (such as Gonzaga University, Marquette University, and Santa Clara University) had greater variability between individual instructors' syllabi. Despite internal differences and consistencies, each institution

appeared to present a particular image.

For example, Gonzaga University tended to emphasize course structure over accessibility to students. While 84% of the faculty listed an office phone number, only 59% listed office hours and only 75% listed the office location. So, it appears that students are implicitly encouraged to call their professors at the office rather than visit the office or call at home (only 6% listed home phone numbers). Creighton University also tended to emphasize aspects of the course over accessibility as less than 80% of syllabi listed an office phone, location, and/or hours. In contrast, Marquette University tended to emphasize both course structure and accessibility.

The average length of course syllabi was 3.1 pages (range 1-15 pages).

While Gonzaga University's and Fordham University's average length was below the overall average, length of syllabi was not indicative of completeness. For example, while Fordham University averaged 2.57 pages (the shortest of the six institutions), seven of the 12 categories appeared in 100% of the syllabi. Length of syllabi was purely a quantitative measure and did not appear to reflect the quality of the syllabi.

In summary, Jesuit institutions are both similar and distinct. The similarities and differences are noted in both Admissions materials and course syllabi. While twelve categories of course syllabi emerged as consistent requirements, not all dimensions of syllabi were equally addressed within or across institutions. Inclusion of the instructor's name, text/readings, and a course outline were most frequently listed (over 90% of all syllabi) with office phone and location, grading and course requirements following at over 80-90% of all syllabi. Office hours and a description of the course/course purpose were listed in 70-79% of all syllabi. Course policies, educational goals and objectives, and home phone were all listed in less than 60% of the syllabi.

Finally, while the Jesuit nature of the various institutions was clearly addressed in the Admissions materials, it did not appear in any recognizable form in the syllabi. This is not to say that the Jesuit values are not addressed in course content over the semester; rather, there was no categorical mention of the nature of the institution, the department, or the departmental mission statement (which should ideally

link or bridge the departmental offerings to the institution).

Discussion

Given that both students and teachers enter the classroom with preconceived notions of what "higher education" is or should be like, they bring anticipations or expectations with them to the classroom (general anticipatory socialization). Additionally, as most university newcomers receive some basic information about the institution, these students and faculty will also be bringing specific organizational expectations with them. One expectation may involve the Jesuit difference. Additional expectations may be derived based on the unique characteristics of the various institutions.

Once faculty and students enter campus and/or the classroom, these expectations will meet the organizational "reality." These organizational experiences will result in met, unmet, or overmet expectations. Met expectations are often not even consciously noted as the experiences fit within the individual's range of expectations. Both overmet and unmet expectations may cause surprise, but it is usually the unmet expectations that are problematic. Unmet expectations represent negative surprises and reflect a less than necessary socialization process to the university and/or classroom.

The course syllabi can serve as a mechanism for the ongoing socialization of students to the various institutions, departments, and/or classes. Based on the results of this survey, however, it appears that the course syllabi represents a missed opportunity for on-going classroom socialization. The current review of syllabi emphasize role-related knowledge (*e.g.*, course requirements, grading, or text) over cultural knowledge (*e.g.*, learning styles, class format); yet, the course syllabi has the potential to socialize students to both aspects of classroom behavior.

The course syllabi as contract also varies within and across institutions. While inclusion of all twelve categories is encouraged, the minimal information necessary for a contractual basis is the role-related learning items such as instructor's name, texts/readings, course requirements, grading, policies, and course outline. While not all categories are equally represented in our sample, these items tended to appear more frequently than cultural

55 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

learnings. The growing emphasis on syllabi as contracts may also be an explanatory factor in the emphasis we see in our current syllabi (*i.e.*, role-related learning over cultural learnings).

Ideally, for assessment purposes, however, the course description, purpose, and educational goals should also be included. This inclusion allows students to gauge their learning in a course and subsequently assess the course and the teaching of the course. That is, were the students able to accomplish what the course promised? The inclusion of educational goals also allows instructors to evaluate which materials to include, how to best present those materials, and the best methods of evaluating educational objectives. In essence, the explicit stating of educational goals allows both parties the opportunity to continually assess the learning occurring in the class(room).

Given the conclusions derived from this study and the perceived potential of syllabi as a tool for socialization, the following are offered as recommendations:

-as a minimum include all twelve categories as your standard syllabus format,

-increase the amount of cultural information explicitly shared in the syllabus,

-occasionally compare your course syllabi with college catalogues and admissions materials, and

-consider incorporating the departmental mission statement into course syllabi.

The inclusion of all twelve categories better guarantees the inclusion of both role-related and cultural learnings in socializing students and faculty. Improvements in the standard syllabus would include more cultural or teacher-related knowledge. Types of teacher-related knowledge that have been included in syllabi include instructor bios, "Who is this guy in the front of the classroom?", and personal teaching philosophies, expectations, or biases.

Additionally, to better relate what happens in the classroom to the larger university context, departmental chairs and/or faculty should review college catalogue materials and general admissions materials. Are we, as a department, living up to our college or university claims? Are we challenging our students? Are we accessible? Are we concerned with development of the whole person? These are questions that only individual departments can

answer. As departmental mission statements should address what is being done at the departmental level and how those activities contribute to the overall mission of the institution, the inclusion of departmental mission statements on course syllabi may remind faculty and inform students how this course "fits into the larger [departmental, college, and/or university] picture." Through the departmental mission statement, students and faculty can realize that they are participating in something larger than classroom learning; they are preparing each other for life.

While these suggestions promise to be useful, their general applicability are limited by the size of the study, the uniqueness of the Jesuit institutions, and the investigator's lack of actual contact with students and faculty. For example, the cultural learnings may be greater than reported if they are verbally shared when faculty discuss the syllabus or answer student's questions about themselves (neither of which could be determined in the current study). Additionally, future research needs to be conducted to better determine the outcomes (effects) of syllabi on classroom socialization, performance, and/or satisfaction. In the final analysis, however, the study of course syllabi as socialization strategy is one area of research where teaching can truly inform research, and research can truly inform teaching.

References

Bateson, G. (1972). *Steps to an ecology of mind*. New York: Ballantine.

Berger, C. R. (1987). "Communicating under uncertainty." In M. E. Roloff & G. R. Miller (Eds.), *Interpersonal processes: New directions in communication research* (pp. 39-62). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Berger, C. R., & Calabrese, R. J. (1975). " Some explorations in initial interaction and beyond: Toward a developmental theory of interpersonal communication." *Human Communication Research*, 1, 99-112.

Civikly, J. M. (1990). "Creating a new course." In J. A. Daly, G. W. Friedrich, & A. L. Vangelisti (Eds.), *Teaching communication: Theory, research, and methods* (pp. 53-63). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Condon, J. C. (1986). "The ethnocentric classroom." In J. M. Civikly (Ed.), *Communicating in college classrooms* (pp. 11-20). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Corbett, H. D. (1980). "Using occupational socialization research to explain patterns of influence during student teaching." *The Journal of Teacher Education*, 31, 11-13.

Danielson, M. A. (1995, April). *The role of the course syllabi in classroom socialization.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Central States Communication Association, Indianapolis, IN.

Friedrich, G. W., & Cooper, P. (1990). "The first day." In J. A. Daly, G. W. Friedrich, & A. L. Vangelisti (Eds.), *Teaching communication: Theory, research, and methods* (pp. 237-246). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gorham, J. (1990). "Individual differences in classroom dynamics." In J. A. Daly, G. W. Friedrich, & A. L. Vangelisti (Eds.), *Teaching communication: Theory, research, and methods* (pp. 207-222). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hess, J. A. (1993). " Assimilating newcomers into an organization: A cultural perspective." *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 21, 189-210.

Louis, M. R. (1980). "Surprise and sense making: What newcomers experience in entering unfamiliar organizational settings." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 25, 226-251.

Louis, M: R. (1983). " Organizations as culture-bearing milieux. " In L. R. Pondy, P. J. Frost, G. Morgan, & T. C. Dandridge (Eds.), *Organizational symbolism* (pp. 39-54). Greenwich, CN: JAI Press, Inc.

Salancik, G. R., & Pfeffer, J. (1978). "A social information processing approach to job attitudes and task design." *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 22, 427-456.

Staton, A. Q. (1990). "An ecological perspective on college/university teaching." In J. A. Daly, G. W. Friedrich, & A. L. Vangelisti (Eds.), *Teaching communication: Theory, research,and methods* (pp. 39-52). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Staton-Spicer, A. Q., & Darling, A. L. (1986). " Communication in the socialization of preservice teachers." *Communication Education*, 35, 215-230.

Staton-Spicer, A. Q., & Darling, A. L. (1987). "A communication perspective on teacher socialization." *Journal of Thought*, 22, 12-19.

Wulff, D. H., & Nyquist, J. D. (1990). "Instructional tools." In J. A. Daly, G. W. Friedrich, & A. L. Vangelisti (Eds.), *Teaching communication: Theory, research, and methods* (pp. 249-266). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Appendix A: excerpts from admissions materials

Boston College

Jesuit ideals of creating intellectually challenging and religiously generous young men and women.

Primacy of teaching in the Jesuit scheme of education lives on in the policies and traditions that shape faculty encounters with students.

Faculty's availability to students-in class, office hours, etc.

Creighton

Jesuit difference

Credo of Creighton

Mission which highlights the Catholic, Jesuit nature of Creighton, which exists for students and learning.

Fordham

Jesuit institution of higher learning

New York institution

Every moment of your class experience here is designed to expand your ability to think critically and to understand the vital connections that link what you learn in the classroom to the world outside it.

Serving Jesuit ideals (*i.e.*, personal attention of a distinguished faculty, who strive to help students develop habits that will enable them to continually to seek and find answers)

John Carroll

100 years of Jesuit education.

Jesuit to the core. . . .John Carroll isn't Jesuit in name alone-but in spirit, in quality, in reality.

Jesuit influence is particularly evident in the classroom (*e.g.* challenging academic expectations, look inward to develop personally, socially, and intellectually)

85% of faculty hold terminal degree

Faculty are available to students.

LeMoyne

Catholic college founded in Jesuit tradition

Five Jesuit tenets

94% of faculty have terminal degrees.

Loyola-Marymount

Catholic comprehensive university. . .dedicated to the ideals of liberal education and the tradition of cura personalis.

Marquette

Education in the Jesuit tradition

Develops the total person. . .teaches students how to think. . .formation, not just information.

Regis

Jesuit. That, in a single word, speaks volumes about the character of Regis University. . . .our focus on Jesuit tradition. . .is sharper than ever. You can see it in the sense of exploration that sets the tone throughout our varied and exciting curriculum.

Educating the whole person on "how we ought to live" (3 seminars)

85% of faculty hold doctorate; 90% hold terminal degrees

Santa Clara

California's oldest college

Five Jesuit tenets

Spring Hill

Jesuit Catholic heritage

Jesuit educational philosophy

Catholic, Jesuit tradition. . .we blend a Jesuit values oriented education with a liberal arts, humanities-based curriculum.

Three tenets: students first; committed teachers; challenging educational experience

University of Detroit-Mercy

Michigan's largest Catholic University

Why a Catholic University? Traditional values, and academic excellence

90% of faculty hold terminal degrees

University of San Francisco

Jesuit education featured on the cover

Committed to the highest standards of learning and scholarship in the American Catholic, Jesuit tradition.

Xavier

No Brand Y.

Jesuit values. . . .fold our Jesuit mission into the classroom.

75% of faculty hold terminal degrees

Student/faculty ratio: 16 to 1

Table 1

Inst name	page av	instr name	office phone	home phone	office locat	office hours	course descr	texts	educ quals	course req	policies	grading	outline
[illegible]	2.84	100	84	6	75	59	47	80	14	54	64	74	80
Loyola-Chi	4.26	100	87	53	93	80	87	100	53	93	67	100	100
Marquette	4.23	100	91	45	86	86	50	95	55	68	68	91	95
Fordham	2.57	100	100	0	100	100	100	100	14	86	43	57	100
Creighton	5.00	89	78	56	78	67	100	100	78	100	89	89	89
Santa Clara	4.68	97	85	38	59	82	79	82	56	71	59	79	76
Overall avg	3.10	98	88	33	82	79	76	93	52	79	65	82	90

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Privacy and Confidentiality As Ethical Issues In Corporate Communications

Thomas A. Schick
Communication Arts Department
and
Ida Critelli Schick
Graduate Program in Health Services Administration
Xavier University

Introduction

In discussing with our students the ethics of professional communications, we try to establish norms that preserve the integrity of the communication process, giving high priority, for example, to truth telling. However, even before considering the norms of truthfulness, we need to consider ethical norms for preserving legitimate privacy and confidentiality.

While all communicators face ethical considerations of whether certain information may or should be communicated, we are considering here specifically communicators within organizations,* for example, public relations practitioners.

This paper searches for the basis of ethical norms that should guide a communicator in dealing with private or confidential corporate information and knowledge.

The specific ethical problems are framed, on one hand, by professional codes that require practitioners to respect the confidentiality of employer or client information, and, on the other hand, by reported on-the-job conflicts in which an employer or client may require a practitioner to prevent the publication of certain sensitive information.

In our search, we will distinguish two kinds of corporate information, entrusted and originated; and for each of these we will consider the principles according to which a corporation must or may hold information confidential. In our discussion we will affirm that a corporation exercises moral responsibility, and we will identify specific stakeholders who might have interest in corporate

information.

Corporate information and knowledge

We want to begin with the broadest possible definition and understanding of corporate information and knowledge. We are talking about all information found within a corporation, information about the corporation, information collected and gathered by the corporation, or information developed by the corporation, including files, procedures for operations, records of business activity.

Excluded from this discussion is knowledge of the corporation developed by third parties from their observations of organization activity. A corporation may be concerned about this third-party information, may react to its dissemination, and may even seek to suppress it, but the corporation cannot control the information.

What we focus on is information and knowledge over which a corporation directly exercises full control by internal management decisions. This information exists within the corporation in one of two ways: it is *entrusted* by others, or it is *originated* by the corporation itself.

Entrusted personal information

Entrusted information is provided to the corporation by another; it has the following characteristics.

1. It is required/requested by the corporation; the corporation does not have it.
2. The request/requirement is met by another; the corporation acquires it and does not develop it.
3. The information itself is revelatory; it tells the corporation something about the other entity.
4. There is an implicit or explicit agreement that the information provided is to be kept confidential. This agreement establishes a relationship between the individual and the corporation, and the corporation now becomes the trustee or steward of that individual's information.

The purpose of sharing this information with the corporation is that both the individual who entrusts the information and the corporation will mutually benefit.

There are several categories of individuals who may find it mutually beneficial to share such information with the corporation. Clients may do so, to achieve benefits for themselves, *e.g.*, better service. On the other hand, the corporation will also achieve a benefit, *e.g.*, to meet

organizational objectives in serving clients. Job applicants will reveal information about themselves in order to be considered for a position. The corporation will benefit by having information needed to make good staffing decisions.

This information, if it remains in the corporation's files, rarely remains untouched. That is, client information grows with additional research. If the job applicant is not hired, application information is removed usually after one year. If the applicant becomes an employee, then her file is enhanced through the various job moves, job descriptions, performance appraisals, etc., that become part of the employee's personnel record.

Before we can consider the corporation's responsibility with regard to this entrusted material, we must clarify the meaning of some key terms, namely, privacy, confidentiality and secrecy.

1. Privacy is control of another's access to oneself; that is, one can grant or deny access to oneself (*e.g.*, one's thoughts, opinions, attitudes, access to one's body also).

2. Confidentiality means to grant another access to information about oneself or to one's ideas, emotions, attitudes, or in the case of medical care, access to one's body, and at the same time extracting from the other, a promise (implicit or explicit) not to reveal this information to a third party.

3. Secrecy is a term which includes both privacy and confidentiality; it means keeping something hidden to oneself or only a few others (dictionary definition).

Let us now look at the foundations for privacy and confidentiality. There are legal foundations. First, Constitutionally, the Fourth Amendment, which guarantees protection against search and seizure, forms the foundation for the right to privacy against government intrusion. The Fourth Amendment refers clearly to tangible property, but is also extended to the intangible, that which is "proper to the person."

Second, there is a common law basis. Warren and Brandeis (1890) in their *Harvard Law Review* article were among the first to enunciate this basis. They state: "The common law secures to each individual the right of determining, ordinarily, to what extent his thoughts, sentiments, and emotions shall be communicated to others." This is the right of the individual to be let alone.

The principle which protects this right is in reality "not the principle of private property, but that of an inviolate personality." For Warren and Brandeis the common law basis for privacy is not the principle of private property but of private personality.

The philosophical foundation for privacy and confidentiality is the autonomy of the human person. Autonomy means essentially self rule. An autonomous person is one who freely acts in accordance with a self-chosen plan (Beauchamp and Childress, 1994). However, individuals cannot act autonomously unless others respect that autonomy, thus establishing the *prima facie* ethical principle of respect for autonomy. Minimally (or negatively), that means not interfering. Positively, this means *enabling* others to act autonomously, for example, by providing them with the information they need to make decisions. The principle of respect for autonomy can be stated: "Autonomous actions should not be subjected to controlling influences by others" (Beauchamp and Childress, 1994).

Respect for autonomy is the primary justification for the right to privacy. The right to privacy is integral to autonomous decision making. It is through privacy that one controls one's personal environment. By choosing to grant or deny access to oneself, one can make different decisions accordingly. One has different options in each case.

A second philosophical basis for privacy is that it is a precondition for love, friendship and trust. It provides the condition, the environment, within which love, friendship and trust can occur. Fried (1970) says it well: "By conferring this right, privacy creates the moral capital which we spend in friendships and in love."

One spends this moral capital also in establishing trust. For instance, in health care, a patient would not reveal her own and her family's health history, and she would not reveal herself bodily to a physician and other clinicians, if she were not secure that this access would be respected by being maintained in confidence.

Additionally, "developed" personal information, such as found in personnel files, also requires the highest confidentiality. It is descriptive of the employee, of the employee's term with the corporation, of others' evaluations of her work. So, there is a special, personal relationship of the employee to that information about her.

There is also a corporate relationship to that information, in that the manager represents the corporation in her actions. However, even from a legal perspective, corporations are very cautious not to share this information with others, *e.g.*, potential employers. And from an ethical perspective, this information is private and confidential.

The same discussion of developed personal information could be applied to entrusted client information, such as a patient's medical record.

Entrusted personal information and its expansion continue to belong to the individual person. It does not belong to the corporation, even though the corporation may own the physical files on which the information is written or stored. Corporations cannot use this information as their own.

But privacy and confidentiality are not absolute. They may be superseded by other priorities. For example, if there is an issue of public safety or of public good, then the individual's right to privacy (or the entrusting organization's right to confidentiality) may be superseded by these concerns. The corporation may have an obligation to reveal in virtue of a higher good and a superior principle.

Ethical responsibilities of a corporation

In our discussion of entrusted information, we have accepted that corporations have ethical obligations of confidentiality. In this paper we accept three principles about corporations:

1. Corporations have no ontological reality beyond their constituencies.

2. In most cases, however, corporate actions are not simply reducible to individual actions. Corporate action is more importantly identifiable as the aggregate of individual actions, which are transformed as each action mixes with other actions and with other input and interpretations of corporate goals, directives, etc.

3. Corporate actions would be described as secondary actions, which are distinguished from the primary actions of individuals. However, corporations can act morally or immorally (Donaldson and Werhane, 1988).

As morally responsible, corporations can enter into agreements to maintain confidentiality, to restrict access to certain information whether entrusted or originated, or to reveal information. The corporation as secondary moral

agent controls information and knowledge through the primary actions of its managers and other agents.

Originated information

With this identification of the ethical responsibility of a corporation, and having considered a corporation's obligations of confidentiality toward entrusted information, let us consider now the corporation's rights or obligations to control access to "originated" information. What can a corporation ethically communicate, and what can it ethically conceal, or keep secret?

Originated knowledge or information is what is developed by the corporation, through its business operations, including "industrial processes, lists of customers, market data, and research proposals" (Beauchamp and Bowie, 1993). This would include knowledge protected by patents and copyrights, but also financial information, and the realm of nonpublic information referred to as trade secrets.

This is information about which corporations are often very secretive, keeping information to themselves, and only reluctantly giving up what is pried from them. While corporate secrecy may be disconcerting, there is nothing intrinsically unethical about keeping a secret, as Bok (1984) points out.

To assess the ethics of corporate secrecy, we must both look at the kind of information being kept secret, and consider those from whom the corporation tries to keep the information secret.

There are many parties interested in corporate information, and many who claim some right to corporate information. Let us consider two nonexclusive, sometimes overlapping, categories of these stakeholders, or publics.

First, there are "decisional" stakeholders. These are the easiest to identify, because by some specific decision each has established a formal, definable relationship to the corporation, such as stockholders, employees, customers and vendors.

Second, there are what we might call "societal" stakeholders. These are individuals or groups who are impacted by the corporation, or who can be or will be impacted by the corporation, not by any decisions on their own part, but because of decisions by the corporation.

Let us consider now the basis on which a corporation can

make any claim to justify concealing information from any of these stakeholders. Does a corporation have a right to restrict access to originated information?

On one hand, we might argue that originated information is the property of a private entity, the corporation, which has a right to use its property any way it wishes, even by keeping it secret. Information, then, is proprietary; and the corporation owns the information (Velasquez, 1992).

On the other hand, it is possible to argue "that knowledge and information are 'the common heritage of mankind'" (Giunta and Shang, 1993-94); all knowledge and information "belong" to society. This is the perspective many developing nations take even with regard to new and original knowledge that is internationally "protected" by copyrights and patents.

That all knowledge and information should primarily benefit society seems especially true of corporate knowledge, since the "business enterprise is an organ of society" (Drucker, 1972), and its purpose "must lie outside of the business itself." Corporations are chartered by public authority in order to achieve a societal benefit. Corporations continue to exist "only by public consent" (Golden, 1968), in so far as they fill their social purposes.

Social benefit is, in fact, the specific rationale for granting copyrights and patents. For example, the U.S. Constitution (Art. I, Sec. 8) assigns Congress the power "to promote the progress of science and useful arts," and as a means to this end, Congress is to grant "exclusive rights" of patent and copyright. The history of the development of copyright and patent recognizes that knowledge is for the benefit of mankind (Wincor and Mandell, 1980).

However, what copyright and patent also recognize are the realities of human dynamics. As motivation to achieve the benefits for society, individuals need some exclusive use and benefit from their works of original creation. Likewise, corporations need to be granted an exclusive use of the knowledge they develop, in order that they can fulfill their maximum benefits for society.

The specific information and knowledge that a corporation can legitimately keep secret is that which is essential for the corporation to operate in the interest of society, and to provide its unique service to the public. This specifically is the nonpublic information that is essential for a corporation to be competitive.

Concerning originated organizational information, then, we can conclude that a corporation not only *may* keep competitive information secret, but *must* restrict access to such information, in order to maintain fidelity to itself and to its mission, for the benefit of society. The information a corporation keeps secret must truly be competitive, as defined in trade secret laws, and as established in court tests of trade secrets. Specifically, the information may not be generally known or in use by others, and the corporation must make reasonable efforts to keep the trade secret information secure.

However, in keeping competitive information secret, a corporation cannot ethically use a claim of trade secrecy to withhold information to which non-competitor stakeholders have a clear moral right.

For example, decisional stakeholders have made concrete decisions that establish their specific relationships to the corporation, and they continue to make decisions that maintain these relationships. As autonomous persons, decisional stakeholders have a basic right to information that they need to make informed decisions in the areas of their specific relationships to the corporation. The corporation and its managers cannot ethically withhold such information, and may have a positive obligation to reveal such information.

Let's take stockholders as an instance. Sole proprietors, as owners, have a right to know everything about the organizations they own. By owning shares, stockholders are legally owners of the corporation; but they do not exercise ownership authority, power, or prerogatives, so their right to corporate information can be more narrowly limited to their specific relationship to the corporation, namely, that of being "investors." It is properly as investors that they have a moral claim on corporate information, the information a prudent investor would use to decide whether to sell or buy a corporation's securities.

This is legally what the SEC requires concerning the disclosure of *material* information, the "timely" release of information, and the prohibition of insider trading.

Also with regard to other decisional stakeholders, such as employees or customers, the corporation cannot ethically withhold information that is directly relevant to the decisions these persons make to begin or maintain their relationships as employees or customers.

As with SEC requirements, so there are workplace right-to-know laws, and content and labeling requirements, which employees and customers need. These legal requirements codify some of corporations' ethical obligations to inform decisional stakeholders, but they do not exhaust the ethical obligations.

Moving to a consideration of societal stakeholders, we find individuals who are impacted by corporate activities, and who have a moral claim on corporate information, in order that they can evaluate the extent of the corporation's impact on them, in terms of benefits and harms. We can also argue that society has a general right to information needed to give or deny the "public consent" by which corporations exist.

With regard to societal stakeholders, however, a major concern for the corporation is always the question of who legitimately exercises society's claimed right of access to corporate information. While ethically a corporation cannot completely withhold information about its impact on society, it can reasonably be allowed to exercise caution in legitimizing the authority of specific individuals or groups who claim to exercise society's rights to information.

How, for example, should a corporation deal with claims for corporate information from government, from various interest groups, or from the media? These are questions that continue to invite much further consideration and investigation.

Ethical norms for organizational communicators

Even at this point, however, it may be possible to outline some ethical norms organizational communicators might follow in dealing with the confidentiality and secrecy of corporate information.

1. An organizational communicator must treat entrusted information with the highest level of confidentiality. He or she must not communicate such information without the informed consent of those whose information it is; and the communicator should not even access entrusted information without clearly legitimate reasons and proper approval.

2. With regard to originated information, an organizational communicator must recognize a prima facie duty to the employer, based on an implied or written "contract," created by the practitioner's agreement to work

for that employer. This duty to employer requires careful attention to confidentiality of all originated information, especially competitive information, as designated by the employer.

3. A communicator must take care not to betray confidential information to a competitor or another who would or could use it to the disadvantage of the employer.

4. A communicator must take care that confidential information may not be used by oneself or by any other for personal advantage, even if the employer suffers no harm.

5. An organizational communicator, however, must recognize his or her obligation, as a primary agent, to exercise personal responsibility in regard to confidential information, or assertedly confidential information, even if the corporation or those in authority in the corporation fail to follow ethical practice. One cannot be relieved of moral responsibility by the directions or the omissions of secondary moral agents, whether corporate or personal. This may mean:

a. If, in the matter of entrusted information, the corporation does not adequately protect such information, the individual practitioner cannot be a party to the ethical violation.

b. If, in the matter of originated information, the corporation -- in the name of competitive information -- withholds from legitimate stakeholders, information to which they have a moral right, the individual practitioner cannot be a party to the ethical violation.

c. In both a. and b. above, ethical decisions by the individual communicator may include one or more of the following: 1) trying to effect ethical action on the part of the corporation, 2) refusing to participate in the unethical action, 3) severing his or her relationship with the employer, 4) blowing the whistle.

Appendix: Entrusted corporate information

In addition to entrusted personal information and originated corporate information, it is obvious there is a third category of information in the corporate context, since information may also be entrusted to a corporation by another corporation, in order to achieve some mutual benefit. For example, a corporation wishing to do business with another often must respond to a Request for Information (RFI) or a Request for Proposal (RFP), which

may ask for detailed information about the vendor organization. The entrusting organization has a right to confidentiality of its information. RFIs and RFPs generally contain a specific statement that the contents of responses will not be shared with competitors in the RFP or RFI process.

Any personal information disclosed in the RFI/RFP process would be subject to the ethical principles for entrusted personal information. Non-personal information entrusted by one organization to another must also be held confidential, because of the right of the entrusting corporation to maintain its competitiveness and continued existence, by protecting information essential to its operations.

The ethical principles guiding this situation are the property rights explored in the discussion of originated information, and additionally the principles of trust and promise-keeping that are necessary for the continuation and prosperity of commerce in any society. From these principles, a corporation has an obligation to restrict access to non-personal information entrusted by another ization, and must treat such information confidentially.

* This paper uses the words "corporation" and "corporate" to indicate any organization, even though not all organizations are corporations.

References

Beauchamp, T. L. and N. E. Bowie: 1993, *Ethical Theory and Business*, 4th ed. (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ).

Beauchamp, T. L. and J. Childress: 1994, *Principles of Biomedical Ethics* (Oxford University Press, New York), pp. 406-429.

Bok, S.: 1984, *Secrets: On the Ethics of Concealment and Revelation* (Vintage Books, New York).

Donaldson, T.: 1982, *Corporations and Morality* (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ).

Donaldson, T. and L. E. Preston: 1995, 'The Stakeholder Theory of the Corporation: Concepts, Evidence, and Implications', *Academy of Management Review* 20(1), 65-91.

Donaldson, T. and P. H. Werhane: 1988, *Ethical Issues in Business: A Philosophical Approach* (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ).

Drucker, Peter F.: 1972, *Concept of the Corporation*, 2nd ed. (John Day, New York).

Feldman, M. J.: 1994, 'Toward a Clearer Standard of Protectable Information: Trade Secrets and the Employment Relationship', *High Technology Law Journal* 9(1), 151-183.

French, P.: 1976, 'The Corporation as a Moral Person', *American Philosophical Quarterly* 16, 207-215.

Fried, C.: 1990, 'Privacy: a Rational Context', in M. D. Ermann, M. B. Williams, C. Gutierrez, *Computers, Ethics, and Society* (Oxford University Press, New York), pp. 51-63.

Fried, C.: 1970, *Anatomy of Values: Problems of Personal and Social Choice* (Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA).

Gibson, K.: 1995, 'Fictitious Persons and Real Responsibilities', *Journal of Business Ethics* 14, 761-767.

Giunta, T. K. and L. H. Shang: 1993-94, 'Ownership of Information in a Global Economy', *George Washington Journal of International Law and Economics* 27(2), 327-358.

Golden, L.L.L.: 1968, *Only by Public Consent: American Corporations Search for Favorable Opinion* (Hawthorn Books, New York).

Sadler, C. P.: 1984, "Comment: Federal Copyright Protection and State Trade Secret Protection: the Case for Partial Preemption', *The American University Law Review* 33, 667-692.

'Trade Secret Misappropriation: A Cost-Benefit Response to the Fourth Amendment Analogy': 1992, *Harvard Law Review* 106, 461-478.

Velasquez, M. G.: 1992, *Business Ethics: Concepts and Cases*, 3rd ed. (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ).

Warren, S. D. and L. D. Brandeis: 1890, "The Right to Privacy', *Harvard Law Review* 4(5), 193-219.

Werhane, P. H.: 1985, *Persons, Rights, and Corporations* (Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ).

Wincor, R. and I. Mandell: 1980, *Copyright, Patents and Trademarks: The Protection of Intellectual and Industrial Property* (Oceana Publications, Dobbs Ferry, NY).

Fordham's New York City Semester

Ron Jacobson
Fordham University

The New York City Semester is a new Fordham University program that allows communications students from other colleges and universities to come live, study, and get internship work experience in the nation's largest media market. The program seeks to take advantage of the city's national and international prominence in several media industries, including advertising, book publishing, broadcasting and cable, magazine publishing, and music/recording.

For example, New York City is the home of Children's Television Workshop and the corporate headquarters of Time Warner, Capital Cities ABC, and many more. It is also the home to, among other entities, the Freedom Forum for Media Studies at Columbia University, the Museum of Television and Radio, the Museum of the Moving Image, and the SONY wonder Technology Lab exhibit.

Student internship sites in Spring and Summer of 1995 included *As the World Turns* (soap opera),*Good Morning America* (promotion division, on-line division), Globalvision, Greenwillow Children's Books (Wm. Morrow), HBO, M. Shanken Publications (*Food Arts* magazine), Marinex Communications (*Casting* magazine;*Trouble & Attitude*, a CD-Rom magazine), Sony Pictures (advertising and promotions),*Sports Illustrated for Kids*,*The Conan O'Brien Show*, 20th Century Fox (publicity and promotions), Ungaro Fashion (publicity & promotion), USA Cable Network, WABC-TV (news/sports), WNET-TV (PBS), and WOR-AM Radio (talk radio).

As part of The New York City Semester, communication students participate in a weekly Media Seminar, during which they share and analyze their internship experiences. For homework, students keep journals and do weekly assignments related to their work activities (*e.g.*, organizational histories of their host companies), and

present research papers that integrate formal academic knowledge with their practical media-related interests and activities. Seminar discussions focus on integrating the students' experiences with academic discourse on media institutions and practices.

For example, during one session students discussed gender and the workplace, within the context of their common reading of *The Girls in the Balcony: Women, Men and The New York Times*; in which reporter Nan Robertson documents historically the struggle to end gender discrimination at *The New York Times*. Communication-related resources of the city are also utilized for the Media Seminar, including field trips and guest presentations.

For more information about The New York City Semester, call Dr. Ralph Meyer, Director, at 1-800-NYC-TERM.

THE TOP TEN
reasons why students should consider a semester in New York City

10. Auditions for Stupid Human Tricks on The Late Show with Dave.
9. NY mirrors ideal student living conditions: It's *the city that never sleeps* -- and rarely does its laundry.
8. Frequent Central Park sightings of John F. Kennedy Jr.
7. Two St. Patrick's Day parades
6. NYC is home to Comedy Central, Woody Allen, and a few hundred thousand bozos waiting to be discovered or rediscovered --just ask anyone named Joey.
5. Get all your news in a New York Post headline (*e.g.*, 6/94 "Police Squeeze OJ").
4. George Steinbrenner, Leona Helmsley, and Donald Trump -- hey, it's a great place to learn about capitalism run amok.
3. Greenwich Village isn't in Greenwich and it isn't a village, but its still puts Dollywood to shame.
2. Take enough taxicab rides and we waive your second language course requirement.
1. Good old-fashioned stress-free living.... in the Jesuit tradition.

Mission Statement
Centre for the Study of Communication and Culture

The Centre is an international Jesuit center at St. Louis University which collects, summarizes and does research on communication and culture, which it then shares and explores with various publics -eccelsiastical, academic and professional

Medieval Stained Glass and Today's TV

Medieval Christians not only learned about religion from the Church, but received many of their mental images and symbols from its stained glass windows, statues and sermons. Modern Christians still get much from those sources, but by far the greatest source of all symbols and images for Christians and everyone else is the mass media—the press, radio, movies and especially television. Television can be thought of as the moving, speaking "stained glass windows" of the modern world.

Centre for the Study of Communication and Culture

CSCC is a research agency with a practical mission: to help Catholics in particular, other Christians and all people of good will find a path through the "forest of symbols" that is today's mass–mediated culture.

Where is the CSCC and What Is Its Job?

CSCC was established by the Society of Jesus (The Jesuits) in London, in 1977, and moved to Saint Louis University in 1993. The Centre has a mandate to study and reflect on communication of all kinds in dialogue with scholars and media practitioners worldwide, in order to:

-Digest what communication researchers are saying about communication and its effect on people,

-Make that knowledge available to communicators, scholars and decision–makers in an understandable and

usable form,

-Promote research which is of special interest to the Church and to other religiously motivated people,

-Promote reflection and dialogue within the Christian Community about the ethical, moral and religious implications of today's communication environment,

-Encourage ecumenical and interfaith dialogue concerning religion, human dignity and the modern media of communication.

How Does the Centre Accomplish Its Mission?
To help do all this, the Centre carries on the following activities:

-PERIODICAL PUBLICATION: CSCC publishes a quarterly journal, *Communication Research Trends*, to broaden understanding of the state of the art in relevant areas of communication research around the world. *Trends* is read by people in about 70 countries. Another, publication, *Communication and Religion*, discusses more directly religious topics.

-CONFERENCES: CSCC sponsors and co-sponsors conferences, seminars and other meetings, in various parts of the world, to promote dialogue on communication issues with moral, religious and social implications.

-LIBRARY: The Centre's highly-focused 10,000-volume communications library, now integrated with the 1,200,000-volume Saint Louis University library system, is freely accessible to all scholars interested in exploring the human dimensions of communication.

-VISITING SCHOLARS: Since its founding in 1977, the Centre has hosted more than 170 scholars-in-residence for periods varying from one week to two years, enabling them to use its library and other resources in a favorable research environment.

-BOOK PUBLICATION: Independently or in collaboration with others the CSCC has produced books and developed book series emphasizing the human dimensions and implications of the mass media. These now total more than 50 titles. They include the

"Communication and Human Values" series, published by Sage Publications, with the collaboration of the World Association for Christian Communication, and a new series, "Communication, Culture and Theology," with Sheed and Ward.

-MEDIA EDUCATION: The Centre has promoted and encouraged research, writing, and other activities to educate members of the media audience, both young and old, in the most constructive ways to use the mass media.

-NETWORKING: To accomplish all this in the most effective way, CSCC needs collaborators in all countries. We send them our publications. They send us information about their own work and about other research going on in their part of world, as well as keeping us supplied with books and periodicals on communication from their countries. If they have questions, we answer them, or find someone who can.

Who Helps?

CSCC is part of Saint Louis University, which provides office space and facilities, and meets many of the Centre's financial needs. The University also helps the Centre develop project proposals and raise funds to cover operating expenses.

But the University has its teaching, education, health care, and many other activities to support, as well. Therefore, the CSCC needs additional help from its friends to have enough resources to accomplish its mission effectively.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE